

COURSE GUIDEBOOK



Ideas in Politics

Part I

- Lecture 1: Setting the Table
- Lecture 2: Liberalism Introduced
- Lecture 3: Liberalism
- Lecture 4: Liberalism in Dispute
- Lecture 5: Libertarianism
- Lecture 6: Conservatism, Part I
- Lecture 7: Conservatism, Part II
- Lecture 8: How Society Works
- Lecture 9: Social Capital, Part I
- Lecture 10: Social Capital, Part II
- Lecture 11: Socialism
- Lecture 12: Non-Marxist Socialism

1-800-TEACH-12

1-800-832-2412

THE TEACHING COMPANY®

4151 Lafayette Center Drive, Suite 100

Chantilly, VA 20151-4232

www.teach12.com

Course No.

485

Ideas in Politics, Part I

Professor Jeremy Shearmur

COURSE GUIDEBOOK



THE Great Courses®

Teaching that engages the mind™

Ideas in Politics

Part I

Professor Jeremy Shearmur
Australian National University



THE TEACHING COMPANY®

Jeremy Shearmur, Ph.D.

Reader in Philosophy, Australian National University

Jeremy Shearmur was educated at the London School of Economics (University of London), where he also worked for eight years as assistant to Professor Sir Karl Popper. He subsequently taught philosophy at the University of Edinburgh and political theory at the University of Manchester; he also served as Director of Studies of the Center for Policy Studies, a public policy think tank founded by, among others, Maggie Thatcher. He then worked as a research associate professor for the Institute for Humane Studies at George Mason University, also teaching for the Department of Philosophy there. Professor Shearmur is currently a reader in philosophy in the Faculty of Arts at the Australian National University. His appointment is in the Department of Political Science, but he has also taught for the Department of Philosophy. He has a reputation as an enthusiastic and popular lecturer; his experience ranges from large first-year classes on political thought and the history of philosophy to lectures on political ideologies for senior military officers from Australia and overseas at the Australian College for Defense and Strategic Studies.

Professor Shearmur's Ph.D. thesis, on F. A. Hayek, was a joint winner of the British Political Studies Association's Sir Ernest Barker prize in political theory. He has published *The Political Thought of Karl Popper and Hayek and After* (both Routledge, 1996) and was joint editor of H. B. Acton's *The Morals of Markets and Related Essays* (Liberty Fund, 1993). He was the editor of a special issue of the *Marquette Law Review*, which consisted of the proceedings of a conference on issues raised by privatization, and joint editor of a special issue of *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* on the political thought of Karl Popper. He has also published numerous papers in philosophy and political thought. Professor Shearmur is finishing the manuscript of a book entitled *Living with Markets*, which discusses, *inter alia*, blood, autonomy, pornography, and the social constitution of the public sphere and offers a positive appraisal of the possibilities of human flourishing in a market-based society.

Future research plans include a commissioned volume on Hayek's political thought, a study of knowledge and institutions that links issues in philosophy to the contemporary theme of "knowledge management," and a history of debates about the blood supply, considered as a case study in applied philosophy.

Professor Shearmur particularly enjoys work in archives, and his labors there have informed his books and led him to several smaller papers and research notes.

Table of Contents

Ideas in Politics

Part I

Professor Biography.....	1
Course Scope.....	1
Lecture One.....	3
Lecture Two.....	6
Lecture Three.....	11
Lecture Four.....	14
Lecture Five.....	18
Lecture Six.....	22
Lecture Seven.....	26
Lecture Eight.....	31
Lecture Nine.....	35
Lecture Ten.....	39
Lecture Eleven.....	43
Lecture Twelve.....	47
Timeline.....	50
Glossary.....	55
Biographical Notes.....	60
Bibliography.....	64

Ideas in Politics

Scope:

This course of lectures explores ideas that are at work in Western, especially American, politics today. Current controversies have their roots in different interpretations of the liberal tradition: classical and welfare liberalism, conservatism, and libertarianism. We consider how such ideas might be applied to issues in real life: How do they affect the design of institutions? How do they respond to the question of unemployment?

A striking contemporary discussion has been opened by the Harvard political scientist Robert Putnam. In his *Bowling Alone*, he argues that Americans are increasingly less active in political participation, as well as voluntary groups and associations; and that this situation is likely to have dire consequences for our lives, from health to political processes. We explore the intellectual context of Putnam and look at responses to it from different political positions.

So far we have dealt with the mainstream of politics. We go on to explore a range of ideas that have challenged the mainstream. We start by looking at the influential ideas of Karl Marx and continue with other socialist ideas, which offer a moral critique of our existing society. We then look briefly at some recent academic work that stands between socialism and welfare liberalism. After presenting these ideas in a manner that should give some insight into why people have taken such views, we turn to some criticisms of socialism.

Next, we turn to ecological problems and the idea that they should prompt considerable political and economic changes—extensive regulation, for example, and the international redistribution of resources. With this thought, we contrast ideas that are often known as “free-market environmentalism.” These ideas are concerned with how property rights and tradable permits to pollute can put markets to work to solve environmental problems. We then turn to a different kind of argument—the exploration of ideas about so-called “deep ecology” and the view that ecological systems should be considered valuable in themselves and should impose moral constraints on human action, much as the rights of other people do.

From this material, we turn to feminism. We explore this topic, first, through the work of the nineteenth-century liberal philosopher John Stuart Mill, who examined the social situation of women in his day and gave his ideas for improving it. Those improvements were more or less in place by the early 1960s and can stand as a useful point of comparison with the ideas of the American feminist Betty Friedan. Friedan’s ideas serve as a springboard for looking at problems of liberal feminism and the wider questions it raises for influential, contemporary liberal ideas in general. We then look, briefly, at socialist feminism and radical feminism from the 1970s and at “difference feminism”—at controversies it has raised and its effects on real-world issues, such as legal

arguments. Finally, we examine responses of liberal feminists to criticisms of liberalism by other feminists and analyze conservative responses to feminism.

From feminism, we turn to other political ideas that bring issues of identity into the heart of politics. We look at nationalism, at its character and at the arguments that have taken place about its desirability, or otherwise. We then turn to multiculturalism and, again, get to the root of current controversies by looking at its development and at arguments between its proponents and its critics. This, in turn, leads us to issues relating to homosexuality, not least because multiculturalism has been taken as one model for gay and lesbian politics. We again survey some of the history here and look at a particular line of argument for gay marriage offered by Andrew Sullivan. His argument is distinctive because, in some respects, it is conservative in character. We then consider objections that have been raised against it by some less conservative homosexuals—and the views of those influenced by “queer theory.” We also briefly examine religious objections to homosexuality.

These objections raise vital questions of a more general character, concerning the relationship between religious and secular authority and, more generally, between religion and politics in Western countries. We look at this issue, and that of toleration, in two lectures; in the second lecture, we also consider issues of free expression and pornography. In this way, our argument takes us back to the mainstream of politics and to issues between conservatives and different kinds of liberals.

The course concludes with a challenge: Does not the collapse of the Soviet Union show our discussion to have been somewhat beside the point? There is now, surely, no alternative to liberal democracy. We explore this claim by considering Francis Fukuyama’s argument to this effect, and we consider how people who espouse the different ideas that we have been discussing might respond to it.

Lecture One

Setting the Table

Scope: This lecture contains four broad themes. First, what would President Eisenhower’s reaction would be, if he were to return from the dead to contemplate the current political scene? He would surely be struck by some new ideas in politics and by the continued influence of others. Second, these ideas might usefully be considered in two ways—as ideals and as accounts of how society currently works, or might work to realize these ideals. Third, taking these ideas as “ideologies,” we examine two different senses of this term—as something we personally possess or as something that only someone else could have. Finally, we conclude with a brief overview of the course.

Outline

- I. Suppose that President Eisenhower were to come back to life.
 - A. He might find the following politically striking:
 1. The revival and immense influence of conservatism;
 2. The lively presence of libertarianism in the United States;
 3. The influence of feminism of different kinds;
 4. The influence of identity-based ideas;
 5. The impact made by ecological ideas.
 - B. All this testifies to the impact of ideas on politics, which is the theme of this series of lectures.
- II. To this claim, the following objections might be raised:
 - A. Is not the key to what people do their interests, not ideas and ideals?
 - B. What about those who have no strong intellectual interests—do ideas have an impact on them?
 - C. In response, the British economist John Maynard Keynes wrote, in *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*: “...the ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood.”
- III. Roughly speaking, “ideals” are the kinds of things favored by people who are wedded to one or the other set of ideas: the liberal favors freedom and autonomy; the conservative favors order, or religious or traditional values, and the socialist favors equality. “Programs” refer to ideas that such people have about what is wrong with existing society or how their own ideals might be realized.

IV. What is meant by “ideology”?

- A. One sense of this term—influenced by Karl Marx but found elsewhere, too—contrasts ideology, which is false, and truth.
 - 1. Only *other* people have political ideologies. If I claim that they have one, I am claiming that their ideas are not correct.
 - 2. This does not necessarily mean that such ideas are worthless or that they cannot seem plausible.
 - 3. They may be self-serving or unwittingly serving some political or social interest.
 - 4. Two examples of this definition include Marxist views of working people who are happy enough with the United States and feminist views of women who wish to be traditional homemakers.
- B. The other sense of ideology can be applied both to ourselves and to others. It refers to the broad assumptions within which people interpret the world.

V. In the mainstream of U.S. politics, ideas, often referred to as “liberalism” and “conservatism,” amount to a standoff between two different interpretations of the liberal tradition.

- A. These ideas, and exchanges between them, form our underlying attitudes toward politics and society.
- B. We will explore how some practical disagreements about politics have different roots in liberalism.
- C. We will spend the next two lectures exploring what liberalism and these disagreements amount to.
- D. We will then discuss conservative ideas proper, along with some features of contemporary conservatism.
- E. We will look at libertarianism.
- F. We will then discuss what all these different views amount to in more practical terms.
- G. Finally, we will look at a current controversy, centered on the work of the Harvard political scientist Robert Putnam.
 - 1. Putnam argues that a striking decline in social participation has taken place in our society, which bodes ill for politics and our general well being.
 - 2. We will trace these ideas back to Alexis de Tocqueville’s reflections on early nineteenth-century America and follow the debate to discuss issues raised in Putnam’s book *Bowling Alone*.
- H. We will turn to a range of challenges to these more or less mainstream ideas:
 - 1. Socialism;
 - 2. Debates around ecological issues;

- 3. Feminism, which is important not only in itself, but also in posing underlying problems for our more mainstream ideas;
- 4. Some other distinctive challenges to mainstream ideas related to themes of identity, including nationalism, multiculturalism, and issues raised by gay and lesbian demands for political recognition.

I. We will then turn back to some issues and tensions in the more mainstream ideas, including issues about the place of religious authority in politics, along with toleration and freedom of expression, both regarding religious issues and such matters as pornography.

J. We will conclude by considering the question posed by Francis Fukuyama about whether the collapse of the Soviet Union means the end of controversy about political ideas.

Essential Reading:

Ball, Terence, and Dagger, Richard. *Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal*, second edition. New York: HarperCollins, 1995. This U.S. college text is written by two knowledgeable and interesting political theorists. It is lively and readable and has pictures of some of the people that we will be discussing. The authors have also produced a useful companion anthology, *Ideals and Ideologies: A Reader* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991).

Supplementary Reading:

Vincent, Andrew. *Political Ideologies*, second edition. London and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1995. This study is much more advanced than Ball and Dagger’s; it is challenging and reflective, but it may take for granted ideas with which you are not familiar.

Dionne, E. J., Jr. *Why Americans Hate Politics*. New York: Touchstone, 1992. This selection offers an interesting introduction to how some ideas work—the author believes, destructively—in mainstream American politics today.

Reich, Robert B. *Locked in the Cabinet*. New York: Vintage, 1998. This is an engaging and self-deprecating first-hand account of some of the frustrations of a man of ideas involved at the heart of recent U.S. politics.

Questions to Consider:

- 1. What ideals and programs influence our own personal ideas about politics?
- 2. Do you have a political ideology and, if so, in what sense?

Lecture Two

Liberalism Introduced

Scope: Imagine a dinner party. Two of the participants get into a political argument. They take strikingly different views about a range of issues, from welfare to the proper role of government. They could both be seen as championing different strands within liberalism. To explain this notion, we discuss three important figures in the liberal tradition—John Locke, Adam Smith, and John Stuart Mill. We look at Locke's ideas about rights, including property rights and a right to charity; Smith's influential ideas about the division of labor, its benefits and disadvantages, and social coordination; and Mill's utilitarianism and his concern for autonomy, toleration, and human self-development. We see how the latter idea was developed by later liberal writers into an argument for welfare. From this discussion, we see how the contrasting views of our dinner table guests draw on these different ideas in the liberal tradition.

Outline

- I. Imagine that we are at a dinner party with a mix of people.
 - A. A professor from a northeastern Ivy League university argues strongly for the importance of welfare and for a welfare state. He claims:
 1. Such a state would be the only means by which we can make sure that the rights of every individual are respected.
 2. Each of us should have the opportunity to make the best of ourselves and to enjoy a measure of autonomy.
 3. The only way in which we could be sure of that is for the government to guarantee it.
 - B. An entrepreneur from Palo Alto strongly opposes these views.
 1. We must respect the rights of individuals, particularly their property rights and their rights not to be subjected to aggression.
 2. For the entrepreneur, this includes the right not to be taxed to provide welfare to other people, where this was seen as a right.
 3. She is not against giving others a helping hand, but doing so is her choice; it is *compulsion* that she objects to.
 4. She also makes a point of giving only to those charities that show themselves to be really effective and to be in line with her values.
 5. To be forced to hand over her resources, she argues, violates her rights and leads to the perpetuation of ineffective governmental programs.
 6. Although she might describe herself as "conservative," the values to which she appeals are, historically, associated with liberalism.

- C. How can two people who have such different views equally claim to be liberals? To answer this question, we must look at some aspects of the liberal tradition.

II. Three key figures in the history of liberalism are John Locke, Adam Smith, and John Stuart Mill.

A. John Locke (1632–1704) was English.

1. He was educated at Oxford University.
2. He then worked for Lord Shaftesbury, a leading politician.
3. Shaftesbury became one of the leaders of opposition to King Charles II whom, Shaftesbury thought, was trying to take power from Parliament and who was suspected of having converted to Catholicism.

B. Locke followed Shaftesbury into political radicalism.

1. He wrote the *Two Treatises of Government*, which defended intellectual liberty against the crown.
2. It appealed to ideas from the natural law tradition, arguing that people have a right to property that they have justly occupied and to their liberty.
3. If these rights were infringed by the government in serious ways, people had a right to revolt.
4. Locke's view was that such a maverick king could be hunted down, like a wild animal.

C. Richard Ashcroft has argued that we have reason to believe that Locke went rather further than just arguing about these things and that he was involved in an unsuccessful attempt to assassinate the king.

1. Locke fled to the Netherlands.
2. After the Glorious Revolution in 1688, Locke returned to Britain and published his work on philosophy and politics.

D. Three aspects of Locke's work are important:

1. It emphasizes individual rights—the right of one's person not to be interfered with and the right of justly acquired property.
2. It holds that people can acquire rights to unoccupied property that did not require the agreement of government.
3. It argues that the purpose of government is to protect those rights and that we can be justified in rejecting a government that interferes with them.
4. These ideas echo down the years to the American Revolution and influence some of our views today.

E. We must keep in mind three caveats about Locke's views:

1. First, the political aspects of Locke's views are, today, perhaps more palatable than the grounds on which Locke based them. He believed that God required that we preserve ourselves to enable us to carry out our duties to him.

2. Locke's ideas about property were developed in Britain, with an eye to defending property owners against unjust taxation. But they had other implications. Locke's views did not admit that hunter-gatherers had rights to the land on which they hunted, only rights to what they hunted and gathered. As a result, Lockean ideas provided a rationale for the dispossession of indigenous peoples by individual settlers in North America and Australia, who wished to "mix their labor" with the land by farming.
3. Locke, in his *First Treatise of Government*, argued that the needy had a "right" to subsistence from the surplus of others—an idea that some have seen as a basis for ideas about welfare entitlements.

III. The Scot Adam Smith (1723–1790) is best known as an economist (*Wealth of Nations*), but he was no mean philosopher either.

- A. Smith gives an account of people's rights that is similar to Locke's, although his view of their foundation is rather different.
 1. Smith argues that these rights allow for the development of wealth within commercial society.
 2. A legal regime based on the recognition of such rights allows for the development of wealth through the division of labor.
 3. People's specialization in different tasks (division of labor) could lead to immense gains in productivity.
 4. These activities need coordination, but in a wider society, such coordination could take place spontaneously through economic self-interest.
 5. Smith offers a remarkable liberal vision of a society in which people's rights are respected, yet problems of social coordination and the production of wealth are resolved.
- B. This picture was extended in the twentieth century by the economist, Friedrich Hayek, who argued that:
 1. In societies like our own, knowledge is divided; different people know different things.
 2. Such knowledge cannot be centralized but can be used by means of the very mechanisms that Smith highlighted.
 3. People can use this knowledge in various social situations, with prices guiding their actions, so as to fit in with the concerns of others.
- C. Smith was optimistic about commercial society.
 1. A developed market economy would permit issues of human well being to take care of themselves.
 2. Maintaining institutions would not be necessary to guarantee a right to subsistence; if economies were liberalized, wealth would be generated so that particular needs could safely be left to charity (contrast this with Locke).

3. To maintain rights to subsistence, and the regulation of resources by government that this would involve, would prevent the development of the extended markets that the resolution of the problem would require.
4. Smith, however, does allocate various roles to government and is not a proponent of complete laissez faire policies.
- D. Smith, although he stressed the benefits that follow from the division of labor, also conceded that those involved in the advanced division of labor may pay a price in terms of damage to their minds and bodies.

IV. John Stuart Mill (1806–1873) is best known for his defense of liberty.

- A. As a young man, Mill was intellectually force-fed by his father, a follower of Jeremy Bentham, the proponent of utilitarianism.
 1. Bentham was a social reformer who argued that we should assess our institutions and our laws and constitution, on the basis of what would make for the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people (that is, utilitarianism).
 2. Bentham was also notorious for criticizing ideas about rights; natural rights were just "nonsense on stilts."
 - B. As a young man, Mill became a radical.
 - C. Later on, he was influenced by Romantic poets, such as Coleridge and Wordsworth, and by a wide range of intellectual ideas.
 - D. He eventually worked through all this and, for much of the rest of his life, offered a modified version of utilitarianism.
 - E. Mill reconstructed a case for individual liberty of the kind that one would usually associate with arguments based on rights:
 1. He argued for the importance of autonomy and individual self-development.
 2. He claimed that if other people tolerated such freedoms, benefits would accrue to the wider society.
 - F. Mill also argued for toleration of diverse opinions.
 1. His argument rested on the idea that knowledge is fallible.
 2. Such an idea may be at odds with religious beliefs that traditionally claim a kind of certainty.
 - G. Some later writers—starting with the British philosopher T. H. Green (1836–1882)—turned Mill's theme of self-development into an argument for welfare entitlements.
- V. We can now see how both of our dinner party liberals might appeal to the liberal tradition.
- A. They both share a concern for individual rights and for human flourishing.

- B. Where they disagree, each could appeal to the liberal tradition, but they would stress different elements.
- C. The “modern” or “welfare” liberal (the university professor) would stress:
 1. Rights to subsistence;
 2. Entitlements to resources for self-development, ideas that he would take beyond both Mill and Green.
- D. The “classical” liberal entrepreneur would stress the ideas that Smith offered as a corrective to Locke’s ideas about rights to subsistence.

Essential Reading:

Gray, John. *Liberalism*, second edition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995. A useful overview of liberalism, written by a scholar who, at that time, identified personally with liberalism.

Supplementary Reading:

Merquior, J. G. *Liberalism Old and New*. Boston: Twayne, 1991. A historical introduction to liberalism that surveys a broad range of material and offers interesting, sometimes opinionated, comments on it.

Interesting more detailed studies on two of the historical figures considered in this lecture are:

Ashcraft, Richard. *Locke’s Two Treatises of Government*. London and Boston: Unwin, 1987. A readable and interesting study of Locke’s thought by a leading specialist in his work.

Muller, Jerry Z. *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993. An interesting study of Smith’s thought by a U.S. historian, which, drawing on recent scholarship, stresses some of the less-appreciated features of his work.

Mill’s own work is readily accessible:

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty and Other Essays*, ed John Gray. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Mill is readable, and this collection of his writings is useful; includes an introduction by a leading specialist on Mill’s political thought.

Questions to Consider:

1. In what sense are each of our figures “liberals”? Where their views clash, which view of liberalism would you prefer and why?
2. Would one or the other of these figures represent your viewpoint? If not, where do you stand? What other views are, in your opinion, of most importance in contemporary politics?

Lecture Three

Liberalism

Scope: We look at liberal ideals about freedom, rights, and government by consent and at the liberal view of the status of rights. We then turn to liberal programmatic ideas. How will society function if rights are respected? What role does Smith’s picture of commercial society play in liberalism? What are characteristic liberal ideas about knowledge, government, and the rule of law? The issue of government leads us to a major controversy between liberals about the proper role of the state. We look at two contrasting liberal ideals: a “night watchman” state, which allocates minimal functions to the state, and a welfare state. We conclude by examining the relationship of these different ideas to the liberal understanding of liberty in positive or negative terms.

Outline

- I. Liberals emphasize the importance of individual freedoms of various kinds.
 - A. These freedoms are typically seen as moral rights.
 - B. Liberalism has a great deal of room for disputes about the scope and character of such rights, as in government by consent:
 1. Government exists to safeguard citizens’ rights.
 2. It is limited by what people will consent to and by their rights.
- II. How does society work with liberalism?
 - A. Liberals expect that if people’s rights are safeguarded, human interaction will generate well being:
 1. Through voluntary market transactions;
 2. Through mutual aid and charity;
 3. Through governmental action.
 - B. Liberals typically hold some distinctive ideas about knowledge:
 1. Individuals are the best judges of their own interests.
 2. Knowledge, including tacit knowledge (skills or “know-how”), is socially distributed.
 3. Liberals reject Plato’s argument that those who have knowledge should rule; rather, if people need experts, they can hire them.
 - C. What about liberals’ ideas concerning government?
 1. First, it should be limited in scope and function by what citizens will consent to and by individual rights.
 2. Liberals favor a self-limiting democracy, typically by way of a constitution, that entrenches rights against simple majority rule.
 3. The proper role of government is debated between liberals. All liberals agree with the ideal of the rule of law; the law should be

general in character, publicly available, and not retrospective; government should normally act only on the basis of the law.

4. They also agree that the state should be broadly neutral regarding people's concerns. This idea can be compared with freedom of religion (but note problems about sects).

III. Historically, and today, many liberals favor limiting the functions of the state.

- A. A state's prime functions should be those of the "night watchman," which include defense and law and order (the protection of persons and property).
- B. To this function, liberals often add the provision of public goods—things that people need but that are not provided or are underprovided by market mechanisms.
 1. Such "public goods" include things from which non-payers will also benefit, such as defense.
 2. They may also include basic welfare and educational services.
 3. Some classical liberals (libertarians) want to slim down or eliminate some or even all of these roles for the state.

IV. But many liberals favor a welfare state.

- A. Those who favor the welfare state believe that the state should undertake all the functions mentioned above and provide:
 1. Welfare services;
 2. Whatever individuals need to develop their talents and participate actively as citizens.
- B. The state should do what it can to foster equal opportunities.
- C. It should act paternalistically to protect citizens from themselves.

V. One important disagreement between liberals relates to liberty.

- A. Following the theories of Sir Isaiah Berlin, the limited state, or classical liberal view, is associated with what is often called a "negative" view of liberty. This view sees liberty in terms of an absence of external constraint.
 1. You and your property should not be interfered with by others outside the law.
 2. The law should protect people's rights to their persons and to acquire property; it should protect their justly acquired property (other than in certain emergencies).
 3. The fortunate should assist the unfortunate, but such people do not have a right to assistance, nor should the state compel altruism.
 4. The core function of the state is to protect negative liberty.

- B. The welfare state, or welfare liberal view, is associated with what is sometimes referred to as "positive liberty." Although this terminology goes back to Isaiah Berlin, use of the term now varies.
 1. Negative liberty is of little use to people unless they have the resources to exercise it—is the homeless person free?
 2. Individuals are free only if they enjoy a measure of autonomy and the possibility of self-development, including the material and cultural resources needed for this.
 3. Individuals are not free unless they are, in some sense, integrated, and not slaves to their passions. (Liberals, of course, because they have a concern for liberty in other senses, are only likely to propose, at most, a limited role for government here.)
 4. These ideas are coupled with the view that the state should be responsible for securing freedom as it is understood in these wider senses.

Essential Reading:

Ball, Terence, and Dagger, Richard. *Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal*, second edition. New York: HarperCollins, 1995. The authors' discussion of liberalism offers a useful overview, oriented toward a U.S. audience.

Supplementary Reading:

Arblaster, Anthony. *The Rise and Decline of Western Liberalism*. London and New York: Blackwell, 1984. Now out of print, this book can be easily found in college libraries. It offers a challenging, radical account of the history of liberalism.

Gray, John. *Two Faces of Liberalism*. Oxford: Polity Press, 2000. John Gray was well known as an advocate of liberalism but has become increasingly critical of liberal orthodoxies. In this, his more recent book, he offers a reinterpretation of liberalism to address the contemporary political situation.

Holmes, Stephen. *Passions and Constraint*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995. A collection of essays dealing with a wide range of academic themes, through which Holmes also seeks to redefine liberalism.

Waldron, Jeremy. *Liberal Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. A striking collection of papers on themes relating to liberalism by that rare phenomenon, an academic who can write lucidly.

Questions to Consider:

1. Just why is it that paternalism is fine in respect to children but not for adults?
2. Why were liberals worried about unchecked majority government? Just how effective is the U.S. constitution in addressing their worries?

Lecture Four

Liberalism in Dispute

Scope: In this lecture, we turn to arguments that liberals offer about the proper role of the state. These relate in part to different views concerning rights and obligations and in part to different views concerning how the world works. From this discussion, we turn to look at four contrasting images of what liberalism might mean today. One is centered on negative individual rights; the second, on commercial society; the third, on toleration and rights to exit; and the fourth, on guaranteed welfare rights. We conclude by looking at some of liberalism's features from a critical conservative viewpoint: Liberals assume that liberalism is the eventual fate of everyone. They promote the privatization of religious belief, and they seem unworried that liberalism may produce rootless individuals, devoid of deep ties to particular national and local cultures.

Outline

- I. The two main sources of disagreement in liberalism concern rights and obligations, and how the world and government function.
 - A. Rights typically imply corresponding obligations.
 - B. This idea relates to the agenda for positive liberty (resources, autonomy, personal integration).
 1. No liberal will deny that such things are good to have.
 2. But classical liberals will ask: Who is obliged to furnish these things to other people, and why?
 3. They contest the claim that these things are rights by arguing that it is not clear that other people are properly obliged to provide these things.
 4. The American philosopher John Rawls has offered some powerful arguments for welfare liberalism based on ideas about what social arrangements people would agree to if they did not know where they would end up in society.
- II. If we favor such things, what is the best way of encouraging them? This question leads to arguments about how the world works.
 - A. For the classical liberal, things usually work best if people make decisions for themselves and make use of market mechanisms, forms of voluntary association, their families, mutual aid, and charitable associations.
 - B. For the welfare liberal, market mechanisms, mutual aid, and so on do not ensure that everyone's need are met. As we found during the Great Depression of the 1930s, sometimes government action is essential.

- C. The classical liberal, who accepts government action only very cautiously, has three problems with this view:
 1. Government's powers are at bottom coercive. We can think of many things in which it should not be involved (for example, paternalism about our individual conduct), even if the outcome were something we might like.
 2. Voluntary initiatives allow scope for experimentation and learning that is not obtainable in governmental initiatives.
 3. Government responds to lobby groups and to the interests of those it employs, not to *our* view of what it should be doing.
 - D. To which the welfare liberal responds, "But look at the problems that the government did address when no other means seemed available":
 1. Civil rights for African Americans;
 2. Racial equality in the armed forces;
 3. Economic problems in the Depression,
 4. A high degree of successful planning in World War II.
- III. Rather than continuing with an argument that is clearly not going to end, let me try to sum up the case on either side.
- A. Proponents of the welfare state argue:
 1. Ideals are attractive and need to be guaranteed to all, as a right;
 2. The whole point of rights and freedom relates to what can be done with them; to reject the idea that we should secure the basics that are needed for freedom is cynical.
 - B. Those who oppose the welfare state (classical liberals) do not deny that the welfare liberals' ideal of human flourishing is attractive, but they are skeptical about guaranteeing it as a right.
 1. For example, everyone has a right to employment at the level of U.S. minimum wages, but the global existence of such a right depends on such factors as economic growth and social change.
 2. It is not clear that individuals who are better off have an obligation to provide others with resources.
 3. To claim that flourishing is just an *American* right seems morally dubious to classical liberals; they wish to think of moral rights as being universal.
 4. More positively, classical liberals stress that their kind of society offers the opportunity to move out of poverty.
- IV. To describe the United States as a liberal society implies one of perhaps four different visions of what liberalism is all about.
- A. The first of these is individualist, rights-based liberalism.
 1. In this vision, liberalism is about individual rights, as in, say, the Constitution—freedom of contract, to set up pretty much any arrangements you wish with others by mutual consent.
 2. People should grow up to understand and respect such rights.

- B. A second vision concerns commercial society.
 - 1. Central to this viewpoint is Adam Smith's concept of individual activity in a framework of laws that respect property rights and a division of labor that affects us and our personalities.
 - 2. Wealth is generated, but distribution is not guaranteed and considerable inequality may exist.
 - 3. A concern here is that people would grow up equipped to participate in such a society and, further, that anyone who fell out of it and its benefits should be encouraged to reintegrate into it.
 - C. A third vision is about toleration.
 - 1. Central to this view is a liberal society where different groups can pursue their interests unhindered and where the government is neutral among them.
 - 2. All that is also needed is a right of exit.
 - 3. This means that people may be free to do things that others may not like and to pursue illiberal actions, on the basis of consent.
 - 4. This scenario raises concerns about government's ability to remain sufficiently neutral and about the rights of children in unpopular communities.
 - D. A fourth vision concerns guaranteeing a wider range of welfare rights to all members of a political community. Most significantly, the other three visions must be limited if they are at odds with this perspective.
 - E. I suggest that tensions among these visions lie behind many of our political disputes today—from elections to the Supreme Court.
- V. From a conservative viewpoint, liberalism contains some questionable aspects.
- A. Liberals expect that liberalism will be the eventual (good) life for all.
 - B. Liberalism's stress on toleration may lead to a privatization of substantive religious and moral views. If the state is supposed to be neutral between good and evil and no real concern is paid to the formation of citizens and the effect of the marketplace on them, will a good society develop?
 - C. The classical liberal encourages a kind of rootless individualism—the creation of financially successful but hollow people.
 - D. The welfare liberal, on the other hand, wants to accord people a kind of guaranteed autonomy, regardless of what they do. Is this not a recipe for destroying individual responsibility, the work ethic, and feelings of responsibility for others?

Essential Reading:

Schmidtz, David, and Goodin, Robert. *Social Welfare and Individual Responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. This exciting

book pitches two able philosophers—a classical and a welfare liberal—against one another on the issue of responsibility for welfare.

Supplementary Reading:

Berlin, Isaiah. *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. This book contains Berlin's "Two Concepts of Liberty," which is often called a classic, and introduces the much-referred-to distinction between positive and negative liberty.

Miller, David, ed. *Liberty* (Oxford Readings in Politics and Government). London: Oxford University Press, 1991. Now, alas, out of print, but readily available in college libraries, this excellent anthology contains material that explores different approaches to the understanding of liberty.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*, revised edition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Questions to Consider:

- 1. Is the classical liberal correct in resisting the idea that what we mean by *freedom* and what is guaranteed by the state should be extended beyond "negative" liberties?
- 2. Is liberalism everyone's ideal future?

Lecture Five

Libertarianism

Scope: In our discussion of liberalism, it was assumed that the state must supply certain services. Libertarians challenge this notion. They also take a hostile view of the state. In this lecture, we explore why they take this view, their ideas, and those of their critics. Libertarian ideas are challenging, but they may seem odd and impractical. However, they have strongly influenced some important public policy institutes, such as the Cato Institute in Washington D.C. How it is that libertarians think that we might be able to do without the state? We start by extending some of the ideas we met in Locke and Smith. We consider libertarians' hostility to the state, exploring two critical views about how it currently works, classical liberal class theory and public choice theory. We then consider some obvious criticisms—that we need the state to supply law, public rules of conduct, defense, and public goods—and we look at some libertarian responses.

Outline

- I. A group of (largely American) thinkers have, in recent years, believed either that “we don’t need much of a state” or that we do not need the state at all.
 - A. The Libertarian Party was, until Ross Perot and Ralph Nader’s efforts for the Greens in 2000, the third largest U.S. political party.
 - B. There is now a whole network of educational and public policy institutions that have been influenced by libertarian ideas.
- II. Libertarianism links Smith’s ideas about markets and coordination and Locke’s ideas about rights.
 - A. Individual interaction in a market setting is consensual, voluntary, and motivated by gain.
 - B. For this to take place, the parties need a moral and legal framework.
 - C. For libertarians, this is provided by Lockean ideas about moral rights.
 - D. Voluntary transactions in markets and elsewhere are to be contrasted with coercion, which libertarians associate with the state.
 - E. Why do they take such a view about government and the state?
 - 1. Libertarians see these institutions as often having originated by force. For example, British aristocrats are typically people whose ancestors helped kings take land from other people or did favors for kings.
 - 2. Governments are seen as still exploitative, because some people earn livings by working for government and government provides many others with resources obtained through taxation.

- III. To explain this thinking, libertarians may refer to one of two sets of ideas.
 - A. Classical liberal class theory was developed by some early nineteenth-century French theorists.
 - 1. It was revived by the American libertarian Murray Rothbard in the twentieth century.
 - 2. The idea is best understood by way of a contrast between those who get their income by exchange and those who ultimately depend on taxation.
 - B. Public choice theory was developed by some American economists, notably Gordon Tulloch and James Buchanan. This theory argues that:
 - 1. Those involved in government are typically concerned with their own interests.
 - 2. The public choice view cautions us to examine the interests of those who constitute government and to see them as acting to further such interests.
 - C. For the libertarian, although government provides all kinds of services, you do not get any real say in what you are given and must pay for it, even if you do not want it.

IV. Objections to libertarianism include issues of law and defense.

- A. Libertarians believe that law is needed, but historically, we have not always needed the state to provide it.
- B. Libertarians claim that codes of conduct (such as the rule of the road, the prohibition against crying “fire” in a crowded theatre, the regulation of what is dangerous) can be handled by means of private property ownership.
- C. Some libertarians stress the role of tort law made by judges and juries in providing an alternative to safety regulations.
- D. In issues of defense, at the domestic level, libertarians argue that people, or more likely communities, can hire security firms.
- E. At the level of foreign aggression, libertarians would offer the long-term resolution of spreading libertarian ideas.
 - 1. Some libertarians would argue that a state would be needed for defensive purposes until this spread occurs.
 - 2. Others would argue that if ordinary people could arm themselves, invasion would be less likely.
- F. What about public goods, welfare, and so on? Libertarians look to private provision.
- G. All told, libertarians do not claim that they have an immediate answer for every question. But they do claim that only conditions of freedom will allow people to come up with answers to problems.
- H. Further, libertarians caution against underrating the problems of the state.

1. Each time a country goes to war, the state's scope grows, and it tends to be reluctant to hand back the powers that it has taken on.
 2. Many people happily try to get the state to give them (other people's) money or grant them privileges.
- V. Where did libertarianism come from?
- A. It clearly developed from classical liberalism.
 - B. Its modern form developed in the United States, where it drew on rights theory, free-market economics, the romantic individualist ideas powerfully set out in Ayn Rand's novels, and the American tradition of non-interventionism in foreign policy.
 - C. It was then given a more radical twist by the change of attitudes in the 1960s and by resistance to conscription in the Vietnam War.
 - D. The result was a loose movement that encompassed a variety of different people, conservatives and liberals, who held the common view that people should make decisions for themselves and not force their decisions on others.
 - E. Libertarianism was also divided between those who wished to get rid of the state and others who were uneasy about the state, but who thought that it should be severely limited.
- VI. What do their critics say? To fail to guarantee welfare, where necessary, to the poor and the vulnerable is seen by welfare liberals as heartless or a denial of rights.
- A. Critics see libertarians' arguments from rights—especially property rights—as question-begging: How can people acquire rights of this kind?
 - B. Critics also question libertarian expectations of markets and a non-state legal system.
 - C. Indeed, some may argue that the state is not as bad as libertarians have suggested.
 1. In a democratic state, we may vote out our rulers and submit them to various forms of public accountability.
 2. Is activity by the state not needed, as Keynesians argue, to alleviate economic problems? Can we not point to other kinds of market failures, say, in the area of ecological problems?
 3. Do Western democratic states not also offer procedural strengths: impartiality, the rule of law, the idea of public reason or deliberative democracy?
 4. What about unchecked subjective tastes, discrimination, and consumer society?
 - D. Some conservatives see libertarianism as libertine.

VII. Libertarianism poses an interesting challenge to traditional ways of thinking about politics and society, not least because it may bring together the highly conservative (e.g., Christian home schoolers), the radical (e.g., those who are deeply critical of tie-ups between government and big business), free-market entrepreneurs, and the genuinely libertine. Libertarianism has moved from the political fringe to being a voice in U.S. deliberations on public policy, for example, by way of the work of the Cato Institute.

Essential Reading:

Boaz, David. *Libertarianism: A Primer*. New York: Free Press, 1997. This excellent and readable introduction is written by the vice president of the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C.

Supplementary Reading:

Boaz, David, ed. *The Libertarian Reader*. New York: Free Press, 1998. A first-rate and wide-ranging companion volume to Boaz's *Primer*.

Friedman, David D. *The Machinery of Freedom*, second edition. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1989. This work presents a radical, utilitarian-based approach to libertarian ideas.

Nozick, Robert. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books, 1974. This selection explores libertarian ideas from a philosophical perspective. Nozick—a Harvard philosophy professor—is extremely clever in his presentation and striking in his choice of examples.

Haworth, Alan. *Anti-Libertarianism: Markets, Philosophy and Myth*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994. A wide-ranging critique of libertarian ideas by a British philosopher.

Questions to Consider:

1. Is there anything that we need done that *only* the government can do?
2. Just how do the services government gives us at the price of taxing us differ from the “services” a protection gang might give those whom it forces to make payments?

Lecture Six

Conservatism, Part I

Scope: At the dinner party mentioned earlier, we might also meet conservatives. That label might cover a range of different views. We will examine some interesting and challenging conservative ideas, developed notably in Britain, and the key role played by the Irish-born British politician Edmund Burke. These ideas have had some influence in the United States, particularly among some intellectuals and policy advisers, in terms of ideals and programs. We will see how these early conservatives were skeptical of abstract ideas and believed that the kind of knowledge that is most useful in politics is practical in nature. We also examine why these conservatives were ambivalent about markets and commercial society, thereby standing in contrast with liberals.

Outline

- I. Our dinner table might well have seated one of four rather different kinds of conservatives, including:
 - A. Someone with a Ph.D. in political theory from, say, the University of Chicago who works as a policy adviser at a conservative think tank;
 - B. Someone who works at the Pentagon;
 - C. Someone who comes from a smaller city in the South and is an evangelical Christian;
 - D. Someone who lives in Portland, Oregon, and makes a living as a kind of community activist and who would be very surprised to hear herself described as conservative.
- II. Conservatism once had a particular character, but in more recent times, it has taken three different paths.
 - A. One of these paths involves a kind of realistic pragmatism, opposed to assessing institutions in terms of their compliance with abstract rights.
 - B. A second path involves explicit championing of moral ideals and the view that political problems are, essentially, moral problems.
 - C. A third path often attracts people who see themselves as political leftists. It centers on upholding community against what is viewed as the overly abstract and individualist character of liberalism.
- III. Conservatism began with a reaction against attempts to modernize the 18th-century French state and with criticism of the French Revolution.
 - A. During the eighteenth century, some people defended older institutions, and the distinctive liberties that they involved, against those who wanted to rationalize and modernize the state.

- B. A key role was played by Edmund Burke (1729–1797).
 - 1. Against the French Revolution and its supporters, Burke emphasized the value of existing institutions (the case-based common law is an important example here).
 - 2. He stressed the importance of custom, habit, and what he called prejudice against abstract ideals as a guide to conduct in politics.
 - 3. For Burke, all societies are imperfect. To recognize that fact does not mean that we can attain a better alternative.
 - 4. Burke also warned that the French Revolution, which in its early stages was supported by most progressives, would lead to disaster.
- C. Burke himself favored Adam Smith's economic ideas.
 - 1. But as economic liberalization took place, a reaction against markets and industrialization arose during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.
 - 2. Some conservatives further developed Adam Smith's misgivings about the impact of the advanced division of labor on humanity.

IV. What are the ideals of early British conservatives?

- A. They favor traditional—often religious—morality and argue that government should foster it. (Contrast this belief with liberalism's espousal of neutrality on religious issues.)
 - B. They believe in actively maintaining social order, which they see as fragile (some of our passions must be restricted).
 - C. They do not believe in the "universalism" of liberalism and socialism—the idea that one way of doing things should fit everybody.
 - D. They are often dubious about liberty and equality as political values. More important is that each citizen has a place in the social order in which he feels at home.
- V. What about programs? (One must be careful here, because of conservative resistance to looking at politics in terms of abstract programs!)
- A. Conservatives often see statesmanship as a learned craft.
 - B. Their views on institutions and people's character are often distinctive:
 - 1. Inherited institutions are valuable because they have passed the test of time.
 - 2. Intermediary institutions (between the government and citizens) give individuals an identity, secured particular liberties, and checked arbitrary power.
 - 3. People are shaped by institutions and education, which empowers us but also limits our flexibility to adopt others' institutions. (Such considerations would be used to explain the problems in the transfer of liberal democracy to the former Soviet Union.)
 - 4. Political leadership and loyalty to leaders are valuable.

5. Property is valuable for its links to the development of personality; it is also a barrier against the abuse of power.
6. Property ownership, however, brings obligations with it.
7. Some conservatives also believe that the nation is important because it provides the individual with a specific identity; society may sometimes be seen as an organism, in which each must play different roles if the whole is to flourish.
8. What about markets and economics? Conservative reactions are mixed: Markets promote prosperity and self-reliance and market-based societies are not centrally controlled, but markets may create wealth without corresponding responsibility. They may foster rootless individualism, and culturally impoverished individuals.

VI. What do all these ideas have to do with conservatism as we know it today and with the different kinds of contemporary conservatism mentioned at the start of the lecture? We will discuss this question in the next lecture.

Essential Reading:

Muller, Jerry Z., ed. *Conservatism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997. A recent, first-rate anthology of conservative political thought, with a useful introduction, that deals with those ideas discussed in this lecture.

Supplementary Reading:

Kirk, Russell, ed. *The Portable Conservative Reader*. New York: Viking Penguin, 1982. This collection, edited by an influential American conservative, offers an anthology of conservative ideas. Kirk relates conservatism more closely to a religious perspective than does Muller.

Oakeshott, Michael. *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1991. Striking and exquisitely written essays by a leading twentieth-century conservative theorist.

Grant, Robert. *The Politics of Sex and Other Essays: On Conservatism, Culture and Imagination*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. Essays by a contemporary writer influenced by Oakeshott.

Scruton, Roger. *The Meaning of Conservatism*. London: Macmillan, 1980. This account, by an able British philosopher, brings out some of the illiberal aspects of the conservative tradition. A second edition is about to be published.

Questions to Consider:

1. Is political leadership a craft, comparable to the skill of a chef?
2. Just why have conservatives, historically, been ambivalent about markets? To what extent are their fears justified by how society is turning out today?

Lecture Seven

Conservatism, Part II

Scope: In this lecture, after a brief look at how conservative ideas have changed in the course of history, we turn to contemporary conservatism in the United States. This we consider under four broad headings. First, we examine the sense in which classical conservatism has continued in the contrasting ideas among some academics and policy advisers. Second, we look at conservatism as reaction. This includes conservatism as a resistance to actions, notably by the federal government and the courts, that have had an adverse impact on people's ways of life, values, or beliefs. It also includes the appeal of conservative values to many people who are successful but feel that something is missing from their lives. Third, we turn to the neoconservative movement, which has influenced public policy. Finally and controversially, some conservative ideas have influenced people who would see themselves as being very much on the left of the political spectrum.

Outline

- I. To link early conservative ideas with contemporary conservatism, we must consider a little more history.
 - A. The ideas discussed in the preceding lecture clearly speak to social circumstances very different from ours.
 - B. Through the nineteenth century, industrialization took place and the political franchise was extended.
 - C. Conservative politicians reacted by reinterpreting conservative ideas.
 1. In some cases, they adopted a state-centered paternalism to try to attract the support of the working class.
 2. More significantly, as welfare liberal views developed, some conservatives made a bid for the support of business and for that of people who were wealthy, or aspired to be wealthy, or simply wanted to improve themselves.
 3. The result was a combination of ideas from the conservative and the classical liberal traditions.
 4. This combination of ideas became particularly attractive in the light of problems encountered by governments taking an interventionist line in the 1970s. In both the United States (President Reagan) and the United Kingdom (Mrs. Thatcher), political regimes came to power that combined classical liberal ideas about economic and social policy with a powerful appeal to

traditional and patriotic values, not least with regard to the Soviet Union.

- II. Conservatism today can be examined through four different groups of conservatives.
 - A. First, I have in mind those who are influenced by Burke, by European conservatism, and by the German-born University of Chicago philosopher Leo Strauss. This small number of intellectuals has had some impact on the world through their involvement in public policy, as advisers to politicians, and so on.
 - B. Oddly, but understandably, one may find influences of two rather different kinds here:
 1. First, there may be a concern for moral principle. This view—which would be shared by many conservatives—claims that no good reason exists for government to be neutral toward what we know to be good for individuals and social life and what we know is not.
 2. Second, in contrast, some conservatives emphasize statescraft, developed in such a way that it amounts to an attachment to *Realpolitik*. This means that those with political power should use their practical judgement, which may well mean doing things that are not principled in the ordinary sense.
- III. A second, numerically significant, group reacts to various features of current society, sometimes by way of contrast with a somewhat idealized past.
 - A. Some of these conservatives feel that government is acting against their values and preferred ways of life as it pursues a welfare liberal agenda.
 1. People who hold conservative social and religious views may increasingly feel skeptical about the ability of a liberal government to speak to the sensibilities of all citizens, given that liberalism is universalist in scope.
 2. In the United States, huge differences exist in sensibility, especially on religious and morality-related issues, between educated, politically active residents of metropolitan centers and those who live outside them. Obvious examples of such issues are abortion and prayer in public schools.
 3. The concern for the rights of minority groups has meant that all kinds of things that once seemed unproblematic—and, indeed, valuable—at a community level have been called into question.
 4. A more intellectualized, conservative objection is also voiced to the idea that we can live just on the basis of abstract declarations of rights.
 5. This thinking makes for a kind of populism that stresses the wisdom and reactions of ordinary people, as opposed to the supposed knowledge of specialists in Washington.

- B. A reaction of a very different kind concerns those who are successful but feel that moral and social order is dissolving.
 - 1. For these people, older ways of life may have had their deprivations, but they were linked to patterns of living that helped one make sense of one's life.
 - 2. In the face of this notion, it is easy to understand the appeal of conservative religious views, which offer clear values and a community structure to back them up.
 - C. What is interesting about these approaches is the degree to which they agree, and contrast, with those of intellectual conservatives (e.g., about the role of moral principle in practical affairs).
 - 1. It is striking that those who take these approaches, for the most part, subscribe to liberal economic ideas.
 - 2. They have tended to reject the view that the problems that concern them have been created by aspects of the economic system, not just government.
 - D. These ideas, although distinctive because they are found at a popular level, are also supported by much policy analysis and other writing by Charles Murray and William Bennett and, in politics, by Newt Gingrich, among others.
- IV. The neoconservatives are an important intellectual group that has influenced public policy in the United States. They include such figures as Irving Kristol and Patrick Moynihan and a number of figures associated with the journal *Commentary*.
- A. These people were typically welfare liberals who became critical of the impact of government welfare initiatives and convinced of the importance of values and traditions in social life.
 - B. However, there are three significant differences between neoconservatives and traditional conservatives.
 - 1. Although neoconservatives may oppose interventionist government policy, they typically favor the welfare state. They just want things done differently.
 - 2. For them, the importance of values is a sociological, rather than a moral or religious, insight. From their perspective, values and (good) traditions are good for society, rather than being intrinsically right.
 - 3. Neoconservatives are hostile to economic liberals and, especially, to those classical liberals who did not address issues of morality.
- V. Some of what goes by the name of conservatism in the United States today does not have all that much to do with older conservative ideas.
- A. It sometimes resembles a combination of classical liberal economic ideas and traditional or religious values, as in the case of Ronald Reagan.

- 1. Government criticism is not, for the most part, focused on the idea that it should promote these values, but that it should stop doing things that undermine them.
 - 2. Interestingly, some conservative ideas have been taken up by people on the left of the political spectrum who would otherwise be welfare liberals or even socialists.
 - 3. The following are three examples of those who hold such views.
- B. Communitarians. Early conservative criticisms of liberalism included two themes:
 - 1. That liberalism was destructive of community;
 - 2. That liberals failed to understand that people's identities were tied up with membership in specific communities.
 - 3. These ideas have been revived in recent years among people who describe themselves as communitarians.
 - 4. Such communitarians are, typically, not conservative politically.
 - 5. They face a difficulty when developing a positive program. For example, the idea that government should favor community raises the question: What community and what values are to be favored?
 - C. Environmentalists. Note that some early conservative themes have been revived:
 - 1. Worries about economic growth and its social impact;
 - 2. A positive appraisal of the tacit knowledge and know-how of peasants and workers, as opposed to the theoretical expertise of academics and political advisers.
 - D. Feminists. Some strands of feminism raise objections that are also made by conservatives, and in some cases, alliances have been made with political conservatives; for example, over the issue of pornography.
 - E. What is important to bear in mind, though, is that in all these cases, ideas may be taken from the conservative tradition, but they are typically coupled with sentiments and political behavior that is far removed from conservatism.

Essential Reading:

Gottfried, Paul, and Fleming, Thomas. *The Conservative Movement*. Boston: Twayne, 1988. This lively account of the American conservative "movement" is written by two "insiders."

Supplementary Reading:

Nash, George H. *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America since 1945*. Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 1996. This work surveys a wide range of conservative and classical liberal thinkers who have been important influences on modern conservative thought in the United States.

Dionne, E. J., Jr. *Why Americans Hate Politics*. New York: Touchstone, 1992. This work includes some interesting reflections on what Dionne takes to be some of the problems of conservative approaches to politics.

Nisbet, Robert. *Conservatism—Dream and Reality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986. An interesting introduction to conservative ideas written by a distinguished U.S. sociologist. It has recently gone out of print but can be readily obtained in college libraries.

Sandel, Michael. *Democracy's Discontent*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996. Sandel is not a conservative, but he is a key “communitarian” intellectual whose work illustrates, in striking ways, the manner in which certain conservative themes have recently been developed by those who would see themselves on the political left.

Questions to Consider:

1. Are there some issues about which all conservatives are in agreement?
2. To what extent can we expect to find a morally principled solution to problems of politics and society?

Lecture Eight

How Society Works

Scope: We have looked at ideas that form the mainstream of politics in the United States today. But what do all these views mean in terms of how society might actually work? In this lecture, we contrast classical liberal, welfare liberal, and conservative ideas about how people are motivated and how society functions. We look at their different ideas about motivation and their views of the proper role of schooling in shaping people's character. We also consider their views on the extent to which government should have a hand in this matter. We explore what these ideas mean in terms of two practical issues in public policy: What assumptions should we make when we design institutions? How should we tackle unemployment? Finally, we look at what these perspectives have to say about the different stages of our lives.

Outline

- I. The main currents of political thought in the United States are classical liberalism/libertarianism, welfare liberalism, and conservatism. How do these three groups see society as working, and how do they see individuals as becoming the kinds of people who can make society work? We find some interesting differences and problems here.
- II. Classical liberals stress voluntary association, incentives, and self-interest:
 - A. People are bound by their own decisions, agreements, contracts, and so on.
 - B. Thus, people may do unpleasant jobs, because they pay.
 - C. They may also do things for non-financial reasons.
 - D. Classical liberals stress that their way of doing things combines a way to get things done with a high degree of individual freedom.
 - E. They assume that people recognize the rights of others and some uncontracted obligations toward others, as well.
- III. Classical liberals also face some problems:
 - A. They may take for granted good behavior by a limited state and appropriate behavior by individuals within it.
 - B. They may be mistaken to assume that ideas at the period of the Founding, which were strongly influenced by British common law and by the understandings and sensibilities of Americans at that time, are “natural.”
 - C. What of the roles played by conventions, and specific institutions, in different societies?

- D. Does the classical liberal approach overlook those who are so poor that they will do pretty much anything to survive?
- IV. In response, classical liberals argue that if basic freedoms are recognized, much can grow and be acquired spontaneously by individuals by way of specific social institutions. Is there a risk that their picture of a good society generalizes illegitimately from the special conditions of a society characterized by a high rate of immigration?
- V. In comparison, welfare liberals think that citizens should have far more welfare guarantees. (Indeed, some of the more radical among them have championed ideas about a guaranteed income, or a kind of bounty, when people reach the age of twenty-one.)
- A. Today, welfare liberals often favor paternalistic actions by government to protect people.
 - B. They are less worried about the ethics and practicalities of social engineering by government.
 - C. But they face a problem: How do you get people to do things?
 - D. In part, their account is like that of classical liberals, although the grimmer aspects of incentives are blunted (welfare recipients may have little incentive to take really unpleasant jobs).
 - E. In part, they give more weight than do classical liberals to social obligations, which often focus on the government (for example, President Kennedy's inaugural remark: "ask what you can do for your country").
 - F. More of a role is played by social pressure: When welfare liberals talk about rights and obligations, they have in mind the idea that those who are fortunate have an obligation to serve the community as a whole.
 - G. Welfare liberals favor state education as a means of shaping people for the responsibilities and duties of citizenship.
 - H. Classical liberals are likely to be skeptical about cashing out social obligations in ways that are tied in with government. They see something sinister in governments shaping character through education, and they see education for citizenship as often amounting to statist propaganda.
 - I. We can, in this context, already start to see two somewhat contrasting approaches.
 1. One approach favors incentives, the shaping of the individual through family upbringing, and participation in the ordinary institutions of a commercial society.
 2. The other puts greater weight on socialization to predispose citizens to specific views and perspectives.

- VI. Conservatives stress the way in which the individual's character is formed by his or her participation in social institutions.
- A. They expect this shaping to be done informally, by family, school, church, and informal institutions.
 - B. They often see these mechanisms as threatened by the kind of social vision that comes out of welfare liberalism. The informal and private institutions so strongly favored by conservatives may be criticized as discriminatory, because they may not be open to those who do not share the ideals and beliefs of the group.
 - C. From the conservative viewpoint, commercial activities may undermine community and, as with advertising, tempt people into activities that are not good for them.
- VII. Institutional design and unemployment offer examples of these contrasting ideas of society driven by incentives and society based on socialization.
- A. Classical liberals advocate designing institutions that offer individuals incentives to do the right thing.
 1. Their critics would design institutions so as to build up trust and altruism.
 2. Classical liberals would ask: Who would be trusted with the task of reshaping people's personalities? Do people who act altruistically, or out of professional duty, always know what you want or need?
 - B. Classical liberals tackle the problem of unemployment by way of incentives (for example, take a pay cut to be re-employed; the choice is yours). The obligations of others are limited to charity; government might provide a welfare safety net, if a case could be made for its having to play a wider role in the economy.
 - C. Welfare liberals favor more welfare assistance, both in terms of cash and in building self-esteem and skills.
 - D. The interest of conservatives in "workfare" is worth noting. In part, this concept is a matter of incentives; in part, of skills; in part, it is a matter of character building (cf. Lawrence Mead, *The New Politics of Poverty*).
 - E. Liberals ask: But isn't the ideal of autonomy and its role in the (paid) division of labor good? Do, say, women really want to live for others or have others depend on them? Isn't contract better than status as the basis for society?

Essential Reading:

Mead, Lawrence, M. *The New Politics of Poverty*. New York: Basic Books, 1992. This is an interesting study in itself, written from a conservative perspective. What is significant, in the context of this lecture, are the assumptions that the author makes about how to motivate people.

Supplementary Reading:

Goodin, Robert E., ed. *Theories of Institutional Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. This collection contains contributions (some rather difficult) by a range of scholars grappling with the problem of how best to design institutions and motivate people to work in the public interest.

Buchanan, James, et al. *The Economics of Politics*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1978. This collection contains an introduction to “public choice” theory and to the idea that institutions should be designed on the basis of incentives.

Green, Donald P., and Shapiro, Ian. *The Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996. A hard-hitting critique, by two leading political scientists, of incentive-based approaches to the understanding and design of institutions.

Ackermann, Bruce, and Alstott, Ann. *The Stakeholder Society*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000. Two Yale Law School professors advocate that each U.S. citizen with a high school diploma should receive a bounty of \$80,000 on his or her twenty-first birthday (repayable, if people have the resources, at the end of their lives), as an interpretation of ideas about equality of opportunity.

Questions to Consider:

1. Just how is it that we end up doing things that other people need us to do?
2. What are the pros and cons of a society based on, say, financial incentives?

Lecture Nine

Social Capital, Part I

Scope: Our survey has equipped us to look briefly at a fascinating issue that is a matter of contemporary controversy: the question of social capital and trust. A Harvard political scientist, Robert Putnam, caused a huge stir with an article entitled “Bowling Alone.” He argued that we have experienced a dramatic falling off in the extent to which Americans are members of various voluntary associations. In his earlier work on local government in Italy, Putnam had claimed that citizens’ membership in such associations was vital for good government. His argument struck a chord, not least because of the role that Tocqueville had given to association membership in his classic study *Democracy in America*. It is also fascinating to see how Putnam’s *Bowling Alone* (the article was expanded into a book) was received by people on different parts of the political spectrum, from classical liberals through welfare liberals to conservatives. Each group typically thought that Putnam vindicated their analysis of how society should work and that dire consequences would follow if their remedies were not heeded.

Outline

- I. The idea of “social capital” has recently attracted a good deal of attention, notably because of the work of Robert Putnam, the Harvard political scientist. His study, *Bowling Alone*, concerns the decline of people’s participation in voluntary organizations in the United States.
 - A. “Social capital” might usefully be seen as social relationships that serve as resources for those involved in them.
 - B. Putnam’s work raises, in a new form, some frequently discussed issues about individuals and society and provides a powerful focus for some of the points of disagreement between liberals and conservatives.
 - C. It all starts from arguments about voluntary organizations, which stand between the individual and the government.
 - D. Although he was by no means the first person to address this issue, Alexis de Tocqueville, in his *Democracy in America*, argued that membership in such institutions served to moderate what he thought was otherwise destructive, individual self-interest.
 - E. Some people claim that an absence of such institutions has characterized totalitarian societies.
 - F. With the loosening and collapse of Soviet influence in Eastern Europe, intellectuals there became interested in the diagnosis of what they were

- missing. This led to their rediscovery of the significance of voluntary organizations and an emphasis on what they termed “civil society.”
- G. More recently, in his study of a new level of local government in Italy, Robert Putnam argued that government worked best where there was a strong heritage of voluntary associations.
 - H. In “Bowling Alone,” Putnam documented a decline in such institutions in the United States, where they had played a major role (as Tocqueville had stressed), and he expressed worries about the consequences of this decline for government and society.
 - I. He subsequently did more research, which he set out in a series of papers and a book, also called *Bowling Alone*.
 - J. The issues are interesting in themselves and because of the wider political lessons that might be drawn from them. The debate around *Bowling Alone* provides a specific focus for contending views about political issues in the United States.
- II. Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–1859) had a French monarchist background.
- A. He initially pursued a career in government service.
 - B. When the Orléans—a different branch of the French royal family—came to the French throne, he moved to the United States to undertake a study of prisons.
 - C. His trip was also the basis for his *Democracy in America*, Part 1, 1835; Part 2, 1840.
 - D. Broadly, Tocqueville favored what he found in the United States but worried that U.S. individualism and commercial culture were potentially destructive.
 - E. He considered the key moderating influence to be various organizations, both voluntary associations and associations that called for government action, and political participation.
- III. Robert Putnam’s key works are *Making Democracy Work*, “Bowling Alone” (the article), and *Bowling Alone* (the book). The terminology he uses—“social capital”—was used earlier by the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and the American sociologist James Coleman.
- A. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* was a study of the introduction of a new level of local government in Italy.
 - B. This study’s broad conclusions were:
 1. The new level of local government worked well in places where there was trust.
 2. Trust was a product of what one might call flat associations, in which people shared a certain kind of equality.

- C. The work was a striking, empirical reinforcement of Tocquevillian themes, but its real impact came with “Bowling Alone” (the journal article).
 1. This article documents decline in U.S. membership in associations.
 2. It suggests a contrast with Tocqueville’s description and with what was, at the time, still part of Americans’ self-image.
 3. It suggests, in the light of Putnam’s Italian study, that this situation might present a danger to U.S. democracy. (Note also Tocqueville’s concerns about the need to limit individualism and the role that membership in associations played in that.)

- IV. Putnam’s article gave rise to a variety of responses because of the way in which it spoke to a range of different ideas in politics.
- A. Some contested whether Putnam was correct in his claims. Some organizations had declined, but others had more members. And what about the Internet and virtual communities?
 - B. Some classical liberals took the view that, if accurate, Putnam’s discovery added weight to their arguments against big government.
 1. They suggested that what we were seeing was the result of government displacing various forms of private initiative.
 2. For example, social security and government involvement in health provision undercut the role previously played by a plethora of mutual aid and welfare organizations.
 - C. Some conservatives argued that, although the classical liberal response was, in part, correct, increasing commercialization was also responsible.
 1. Commercialization was supplying what, in the past, had been provided by means of mutual aid.
 2. It was threatening such institutions as the family, which were vital for the provision of social capital and much else.
 - D. Some welfare liberals agreed with the conservatives about the impact of commerce and with the growing economic rationalization of society.
 1. But they typically took a very different view of government.
 2. They maintained that it could equally play a positive role, some advocating the idea that government should work like voluntary organizations in supplying services.

Essential Reading:

Putnam, Robert. “Bowling Alone,” *Journal of Democracy* 6, No. 1, January 1995, pp. 65–78. This was the journal article in which Putnam first discussed his worries about the decline of social capital in the United States. It should be readily available in college libraries and is currently offered on the Internet at the following URL: http://muse.jhu.edu/demo/journal_of_democracy/v006/putnam.html.

Supplementary Reading:

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. For example, tr. George Lawrence, ed. J. P. Mayer, London: Fontana, 1994. See, especially, Part I, chapters 4 and 6; Part 2 chapters 1–8.

Fukuyama, Frances. *Trust*. New York: Free Press, 1996. An interesting study of issues related to trust and social capital by a conservative.

Putnam, Robert. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994. Putnam's study of the introduction of a new level of Italian local government, which sparked his work on social capital.

Coleman, James. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1994. A heavy book—in more ways than one—on social theory, including Coleman's early work on the idea of social capital.

Questions to Consider:

1. Are you a member of any voluntary organizations, and do you spend as much time involved with them as your parents did?
2. Does membership in voluntary organizations matter?

Lecture Ten Social Capital, Part II

Scope: Putnam undertook extensive research, spurred in part by critics and interpreters of his earlier work. In 2000, he brought out a massive book, also called *Bowling Alone*. He provided a vast range of evidence to support his contention that voluntary participation had declined and explored a variety of ideas about what might be responsible for this situation. He also discussed its significance and suggested how the concerned citizen might respond. This work is fascinating, not only for its thesis, but also for the light that it throws on different facets of contemporary American society and what it is becoming. We will explore some of the key features of this fascinating work and examine Putnam's suggested responses to the problems that he raises. We will also examine the idea of social capital itself.

Outline

- I. One key theme in Putnam's work is detailed documentation, from a whole range of sources, of decline in social participation over time in the United States.
 - A. Putnam argues that since the end of World War II, both formal and informal social participation has declined.
 - B. This situation is the result of an age-cohort-based effect—people from an earlier generation participated more and continued to do so into old age.
 - C. But from those born from the end of World War II on (baby boomers), the decline in participation becomes increasingly marked over time.
 - D. Certain exceptions to this trend exist.
 1. Evangelical Christians, for example, tend to be heavy participators but restrict their participation to issues connected with their faith.
 2. Also, Putnam sees signs of a small upturn in participation among the young.
- II. Putnam also argues that participation matters, that a high level of social capital is related to:
 - A. Good schools and education experiences for children;
 - B. Safe and productive neighborhoods;
 - C. Economic prosperity, notably in terms of job opportunities that a diffuse network may provide;
 - D. Personal health and well being: getting out to even one association meeting a month can do much for one's health;

- E. The operations of democracy and government. (Here, he returns to his earlier Italian study.)

III. What is to blame for this decline in social participation?

- A. Here, Putnam's message is less than clear-cut.
- B. He has pursued and tested a range of different suggestions and concludes:
 - 1. Television;
 - 2. Work pressures (not least on women);
 - 3. Long commuting times;
 - 4. Generational change, which seems most significant. World War II instilled a sense of community not experienced by those born after it; home-based entertainment now offers some of the world's best material.

IV. Putnam concludes his book by exploring possible solutions at individual and institutional levels. These include the encouragement of:

- A. Civic education and participation in schools;
- B. Community-congenial and family-friendly policies in the workplace;
- C. Planning that reduces commuting time;
- D. A pluralistic, socially responsible, and tolerant religious revival;
- E. Electronic entertainment that reinforces, rather than undermines, community;
- F. Social capital in which we interact with people unlike ourselves through, for example, cultural and artistic activities.
- G. Active participation in political and civic life.

V. Social capital seems, just now, to have almost a motherhood and apple pie status. At the risk of evoking Scrooge at Christmas, I would like to offer some critical reflections.

- A. Many who grew up in the 1950s and early 1960s found that period stultifying and restrictive; the growth of television, high-quality home entertainment, and the Internet was liberating.
- B. The generation formed by World War II, the heroes of Putnam's story, were subjected to some rather intensive social shaping by the government (c.f. Paul Fussell's *Wartime*).
- C. Some of Putnam's concerns relate to the impact of mechanisms that have been felt to be exclusionary; for example, the reaction against informal, network-based recruitment, as opposed to publicly advertised recruitment.
- D. More generally, informal exercise of authority—say, over children—is much more difficult given current ideas about rights.

- E. Some of the problems raised about welfare liberalism in Lecture Eight seem to recur here.
- F. Although Putnam's ideas about cultivating arrangements that would produce social capital as a byproduct are interesting, he may not address some of the underlying issues.

VI. Let us consider alternatives; in particular, the extent to which the problems that Putnam raises can be handled if individualism is here to stay.

- A. Commercial organizations can offer some solutions: we used to trust strangers with our financial transactions; this can now be resolved by means of a credit card. (c.f. Daniel Klein's collection, *Reputation*, for examples of commercial and informal mechanisms that deal with these issues.)
- B. Private residential communities could become the norm. Obviously, such an idea would require major rethinking about existing practices, not least, about the issue of discrimination.

VII. This alternative highlights a problem in the concept of social capital.

- A. Putnam distinguishes between inclusive arrangements (which he favors) and those that are exclusive (e.g., that only include members of a particular ethnic group). That is as far as his analysis goes.
- B. I think that these matters deserve closer attention. Let me give one example.
 - 1. Putnam stresses the issue of trust.
 - 2. This implies mechanisms of policing and exclusion, if necessary.
 - 3. Alternatively, communities could be created that enforce conformity and limit their members to interactions with other community members. This solution is unlikely to be attractive.
- C. But the development of mechanisms to handle trust—especially where one is part of a large society and interacts with strangers—may not work as Putnam suggests.
 - 1. The development of credit bureaus and credit cards, for example, has made it more difficult than it once was for those who do not have a credit record to get a loan or an apartment.
 - 2. Such problems could force us back on the resources of a community—say, an ethnic community narrowly defined.

Essential Reading:

Putnam, Robert. *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000. This book is fascinating, not only for its broad argument but also for the incredible wealth of interesting detail about social change during the twentieth century and the kind of lives that we lead now.

Supplementary Reading:

Foldvary, Fred E. *Public Goods and Private Communities: The Market Provision of Social Services*. Aldershot, England, and Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar, 1994. Contains fascinating information about the operation of private communities.

Fussell, Paul. *Wartime: Understanding and Behavior in the Second World War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989. A fascinating and somewhat alarming study of the way in which people's ideas and behavior were shaped by government during the Second World War.

Klein, Daniel, ed. *Reputation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997. A fascinating mixture of history and economic theory, dealing with how problems of trust have been overcome, informally, by commercial and noncommercial means.

Rosenblum, Nancy. *Membership and Morals*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000. An interesting and wide-ranging study of a number of different kinds of associations and the roles they play in their members' lives, including militias! The book is worth reading as a reminder of the character of some forms of associations.

Questions to Consider:

1. How effective is Putnam's response to the problems that he has raised?
2. Can we live good lives in a world without much social capital in Putnam's sense?

Lecture Eleven

Socialism

Scope: This lecture introduces the influential socialist theory of Marxism. Marx's view of history and of his own society and its dynamics are discussed. We look at Marx's ideas about how politics function, including how the state usually serves the interests of the owners of capital. We round out this overview by discussing Marx's expectations of a future socialist society. We then turn to the question of what actually happened in the Soviet Union and its impact on Marxist ideas.

Outline

- I. The key ideas of socialism concern social ownership of the means of production, rather than individual ownership, and the ideal of equality.
 - A. Socialism, in anything like its modern form, really started in the early nineteenth century.
 - B. The founding figures, often referred to as "utopian socialists," typically favored experimental living in small-scale communities. Although these experiments were sometimes interesting, they were not successful.
- II. Interpretation of the views of Karl Marx (1818–1883) has been controversial.
 - A. For Marx, history is an unfinished story of human freedom, and the key to its significance is class struggle.
 - B. Through history, human productive forces have developed, including technology, skills, and labor.
 1. This development takes place in what Marx termed "systems of the relations of production" (that is, ownership and the human relationships that flow from them).
 2. Particularly important are what Marx called the ownership and control of the means of production, including factories, power, raw materials, and human labor.
 3. Initially, the relations of production form a framework appropriate to the development of productive forces. Later, they become a constraint, and the tensions are fought out in the realms of ideas and politics.
 4. Marx offered the French Revolution as an illustration: Feudalism and the old French regime had been outgrown by the development of human productive forces. The subsequent revolution led to a regime that was appropriate for the further development of human productive forces—capitalism.

5. But, Marx argued, capitalism itself has been outgrown; capitalism produces the working class, which will overthrow it and institute socialism.
 6. For Marx, socialism permits the rational administration of products of human productive powers to the benefit of all.
- C. Marx saw capitalism as the key feature of society.
1. In Marx's view, such a system is economically unstable.
 2. Further, it exploits working people, even when a fair exchange in employment exists. The owners of capital get more out of labor than it costs them to acquire it, while workers have to sell their labor in order to survive.
- D. Capitalism usually runs in the interests of owners of capital, whoever is in power.
- E. Reform in capitalism cannot, in Marx's view, address the fundamental problems of society. What is to be done?
1. Marx expected the development of a polarization between workers and the owners of capital.
 2. He thought that the working class, when it understood what was really going on and that it had the power to change things, would initiate change.
 3. This change would require political organization and social revolution.
- III. Marx did not want to offer blueprints, but he expected that the transformation of society would require the violent overthrow of government. He thought that, in some countries, the transition might possibly take place through parliament and democratic institutions.
- A. Initially, a "dictatorship of the proletariat" would form.
1. In this sense, "dictatorship" meant that a citizen would take charge in the emergency but return to ordinary life when it was over.
 2. This would secure a new regime in which private ownership would not exist—the means of production would be under democratic control.
 3. Income at this point would depend on people's social contributions. Marx thought that people would eventually willingly contribute and receive on the basis of need.
 4. Unpleasant work would be minimized.
- B. What form would political organization take in the future? We can draw hints from what Marx wrote about the Paris Commune of 1870, a brief period in which ordinary people held political power in Paris (see Marx's *Civil War in France*).
1. There would be no armed forces separate from the people.
 2. The state apparatus would be cut right back; administration would be undertaken by working people.

3. Political functions would be discharged by recallable delegates. The system would be democratic, but not a parliamentary or U.S.-style democracy.
- IV. Marx expected socialism to be the product of capitalism and believed that revolutions would occur in advanced countries in Western Europe.
- A. He thought a move to socialism was possible in Russia but only as part of a more general revolution.
- B. The Russian Revolution spawned a regime that was identified with socialism, and both its champions and critics considered it to be on the path to communism.
- C. Although Stalin and later rulers of the U.S.S.R. tried to legitimate what they were doing in terms of Marx's work, huge gulf existed between what they created and Marx's expectations.
- D. Those who equated the Soviet Union with Marxism saw its collapse as the end of the road for Marxism.
1. Others warned that although the Soviet Union was not what Marx had expected, much of what had happened there pointed to serious problems for his ideas. They were referring to problems of trying to run a sophisticated economy without markets, concentrated power, and democratic control of concentrated power.
 2. Some Marxists saw what happened in the Soviet Union, and the subsequent political changes there, as a vindication of their critique of that regime.

Essential Reading:

Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich. *The Communist Manifesto*. This work is available in many editions. It is an interesting and readable historical document and offers a striking introduction to Marx's ideas.

Supplementary Reading:

McLellan, David. *The Thought of Karl Marx: An Introduction*. London: Macmillan, 1980. Currently out of print but easily obtainable in any college library, this book provides a first-rate guide through Marx's works by period and theme, from which one can get a real feel for some of his concerns.

Callinicos, Alex. *The Revolutionary Ideas of Karl Marx*. London: Bookmarks, 1983. Also out of print, this book offers a lively introduction to Marx from the perspective of a Marxist activist, who is also a professor of political thought.

———. *The Revenge of History*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991. This work shows how a Marxist can take a positive view of the collapse of the Soviet Union and of Soviet-dominated regimes in Eastern Europe.

Elster, Jon. *An Introduction to Karl Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. An introduction to Marx's work by a writer who combines criticism with a measure of sympathy for Marx's socialism.

Berlin, Isaiah. *Karl Marx: His Life and Environment*, fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. The latest edition of a "classic" biography of Marx by a writer who is critical of Marxism.

Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971. The second volume of this work offers a powerful critique of Marx from a philosopher who, when young, was briefly a Marxist and who retained some moral sympathy with Marx's perspective.

Questions to Consider:

1. Does politics largely operate in the interests of the owners of capital?
2. Does the collapse of the Soviet Union mean the end of Marxism?

Lecture Twelve

Non-Marxist Socialism

Scope: Marx's ideas have had considerable historical influence, but they are by no means the only strand in socialist thought. Other ideas appeal more directly to moral considerations. Through socialist eyes, societies like our own may be seen as badly flawed from a moral standpoint. Socialists see socialism as the full realization of democracy. They argue that although all of us approve of democracy, we do not take democratic ideals seriously, especially in the economic sphere. We will look at a striking line of socialist argument, which suggests that if we take liberal ideals seriously, we will be led from liberal to socialist ideas about how society should be organized. Finally, we look briefly at some ideas that are currently being developed in academe that open up interesting ground between welfare liberalism and socialism.

Outline

- I. Marxist ideas have been, and still are, influential, especially in some academic circles, but we should not equate socialism with Marxism. Historically, socialism has made a strong moral appeal; many socialists are so for reasons not connected with Marxist analysis.
 - A. Socialist ideals are diverse.
 1. At one level, socialists agree on the importance of equality, fraternity, and liberty as values.
 2. They also agree on what is wrong with existing social arrangements: private ownership of the means of production and an economic system based on greed and self-interest.
 3. They also, however, have a range of other concerns that we can usefully approach from one of two directions.
 - B. Socialism can be applied as a critique of capitalism.
 1. From a socialist perspective, wealth is a social product, but it is unfairly distributed under capitalism.
 2. Markets and/or capitalism are inefficient; unemployment may be in evidence and resources may be under-used or trivial goods may be produced when people are in dire need. We need economic planning to make the best use of our resources.
 3. Production should focus on human need, not just profit. (A counterargument is that markets respond to demand, not to need.)
 4. Wealth should enable us to meet the needs of all, not just the productive or the lucky.
 5. Capitalism is destructive of fellowship and community.

6. Cooperation, not greed, selfishness, or fear, should be the basis of our economic and social arrangements.
 - C. Socialism can be seen as the completion of democracy.
 1. Although the nineteenth and twentieth centuries saw the growth of political democracy, only a few people have a real say in what happens; there is no democracy in the workplace or in economic activity more generally.
 2. Capitalism results in exploitation and inequalities of resources and power, which have no moral justification.
 3. Accordingly, we must move to social ownership, or a fundamental shift of power and resources to the working class.
 - D. Socialism can also be seen as necessary to fully realize liberal ideas.
 1. Liberalism's attack on privilege and its emphasis on rights was appropriate in its historical context, but formal rights are useless if people do not possess the resources to implement their rights.
 3. Self-development requires equalization of rewards and privileges.
 4. Social rights of women as a disadvantaged group, of the disabled, and of other minority groups are now often recognized by liberals, especially welfare liberals. But they cannot be fully addressed in the economic arrangements that liberals favor.
 5. To sum up: Taking liberalism seriously leads us beyond liberalism.
- II. Does this mean that equality and liberty are at odds?
- A. One socialist response might be as follows:
 1. Liberals admit limitations on liberty, but some people can be hurt by a system that enshrines liberal ideas about freedom.
 2. We need to reinterpret freedom so that it can be enjoyed by all. (Note the way in which one person's private property is a restriction on what others can do.)
 3. This reinterpretation will mean restrictions on liberals' (defective) ideas about freedom. (Compare liberals' restriction of the freedom of the would-be slave owner.)
 - B. Marxists generally share these values, too.
 - C. What, then, is distinctive about Marxism?
 1. The centrality of Marx's explanatory theory;
 2. Its emphasis on historical process and the working class—not on ideals and how to realize them;
 3. Its stress on the need to change the entire basis of the economic system. Marxists are, typically, revolutionary, while other socialists may be gradualists and reformists.
- III. Although non-Marxist socialism may sound a bit old-fashioned, it has, in fact been reinvigorated by a range of recent, high-powered academic scholarship.

- A. John Rawls, a Harvard philosopher and welfare liberal, has raised questions about the fairness of societies like ours, including the striking question: Do you deserve your talents?
- B. A. K. Sen argued that in actual cases of famine, food shortage was not necessarily a problem. Food was sometimes exported from famine areas.
 1. The problem is that some people do not command the resources to acquire what they need.
 2. Historically, famines do not take place in democracies.
 3. Sen's work has revived ideas about entitlements and what makes for effective democratic participation.

Essential Reading:

Harrington, Michael. *The Other America*. New York: Collier, 1997. This reprint of a book first published in 1962 offers a hard-hitting look at the United States from a socialist perspective.

Supplementary Reading:

Berki, R. N. *Socialism*. London: Dent, 1975. This work offers a useful introduction to socialist ideas. It is currently out of print but should be easily available in college libraries.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971. Rawls is, emphatically, not a socialist but a welfare liberal. Some of the ideas in his work, however, have led to a reinvigoration of the territory between welfare liberalism and socialism.

Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books, 1999. Sen is also not a socialist, but his work on the significance of entitlements and democracy, and on the freedoms of those in both Western and developing countries, has also helped to reinvigorate the area between non-Marxist socialism and welfare liberalism as we are familiar with it in the practice of Western countries today.

Tawney, Richard Henry. *Equality*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1931. A powerful study by an influential British socialist inspired by Christian ideals. It went through many editions and is available in college libraries or used bookstores.

Wright, Anthony. *Socialisms: Theories and Practises*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1986. A survey of various interpretations of socialism by a British writer who has considerable sympathy for socialist ideals.

Questions to Consider:

1. Is our society a fair or a just society?
2. Can anything be said to justify the huge contrasts between wealth and poverty that currently exist in the world today?

Timeline

427 B.C.	Birth of Plato
347 B.C.	Death of Plato
168 B.C.	Beginning of Maccabean Revolt
142 B.C.	Suppression of Maccabean Revolt
1364	Birth of Christine de Pisan
1430	Death of Christine de Pisan
1622	Birth of Algernon Sydney
1630	Birth of Charles II
1632	Birth of John Locke
1671	Birth of Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury
1682	John Locke and the Earl of Shaftesbury flee England to the Netherlands
1683	Death of Algernon Sydney
1685	Death of Charles II
1688	The Glorious Revolution and the abdication/deposition of James II
1689	Publication of <i>A Letter Concerning Toleration</i> by John Locke
1690	Publication of <i>The Two Treatises of Government</i> by John Locke
1697	Execution of Thomas Aikenhead for blasphemy in Edinburgh, Scotland
1704	Death of John Locke
1709	Birth of John Cleland
1712	Birth of Jean-Jacques Rousseau
1713	Death of Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury
1723	Birth of Adam Smith
1729	Birth of Edmund Burke
1743	Birth of Thomas Jefferson

1748	Birth of Jeremy Bentham
1770	Birth of William Wordsworth
1772	Birth of Samuel Taylor Coleridge
1772	Birth of Charles Fourier
1773	Birth of James Mill
1776	Publication of <i>An Inquiry Concerning the Nature and Cause of the Wealth of Nations</i> by Adam Smith
1776	Outbreak of the American Revolution
1778	Death of Jean-Jacques Rousseau
1789	Outbreak of the French Revolution
1790	Death of Adam Smith
1797	Death of Edmund Burke
1805	Birth of Alexis de Tocqueville
1806	Birth of John Stuart Mill
1815	Restoration of the Bourbons to the French throne
1818	Birth of Karl Marx
1820	Birth of Friedrich Engels
1826	Death of Thomas Jefferson
1832	Death of Jeremy Bentham
1834	Death of Samuel Taylor Coleridge
1835	Publication of volume one of <i>Democracy in America</i> by Alexis de Tocqueville
1836	Death of James Mill
1840	Publication of volume two of <i>Democracy in America</i> by Alexis de Tocqueville
1848	Publication of <i>The Communist Manifesto</i> by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels
1859	Death of Alexis de Tocqueville
1859	Publication of <i>On Liberty</i> by John Stuart Mill

1861.....Composition of *On the Subjection of Women*
by John Stuart Mill

1861.....Foundation of the modern state of Italy

1864.....Birth of Max Weber

1869.....Publication of *On the Subjection of Women*
by John Stuart Mill

1870.....The Paris Commune

1871.....Foundation of the modern state of Germany

1873.....Death of John Stuart Mill

1879.....Birth of Joseph Stalin

1883.....Birth of John Maynard Keynes

1883.....Death of Karl Marx

1890.....Birth of Dwight Eisenhower

1895.....Death of Friedrich Engels

1899.....Birth of Friedrich von Hayek

1901.....Birth of Michael Oakeshott

1901.....Birth of Ruhola (the Ayatollah) Khomeini

1902.....Birth of Karl Popper

1907.....Birth of Isaiah Berlin

1911.....Birth of Ronald Reagan

1913.....Death of Ferdinand de Saussure

1917.....Outbreak of the Russian Revolution and the
beginning of the Soviet Union

1917.....Birth of John Fitzgerald Kennedy

1919.....Birth of James Buchanan

1920.....Death of Max Weber

1920.....Birth of Irving Kristol

1921.....Birth of John Rawls

1922.....Birth of Thomas Kuhn

1922.....The coming to power of the Fascists in Italy

1925.....Birth of Frantz Fanon

1925.....Birth of Margaret Thatcher

1926.....Birth of Murray Rothbard

1927.....Birth of Patrick Moynihan

1928.....Publication of *Lady Chatterly's Lover* by D.
H. Lawrence

1929.....Beginning of the Great Depression

1933.....The coming to power of the National
Socialists in Germany

1936.....Publication of *The General Theory of
Employment, Interest and Money* by John
Maynard Keynes

1936.....Birth of Carol Gilligan

1938.....Birth of Robert Nozick

1938.....Birth of Pat Buchanan

1939.....Outbreak of World War Two

1942.....Birth of Newt Gingrich

1945.....Conclusion of World War Two

1946.....Death of John Maynard Keynes

1947.....Birth of Salman Rushdie

1953.....Death of Joseph Stalin

1953.....Birth of David Boaz

1961.....Death of Frantz Fanon

1962.....Publication of *The Structure of Scientific
Revolutions* by T. S. Kuhn

1963.....Death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy

1963.....Publication of *The Feminine Mystique* by
Betty Friedan

1969.....Death of Dwight Eisenhower

1970.....Publication of *Sexual Politics* by Kate
Millett

1971.....Publication of *A Theory of Justice* by John
Rawls

1972.....	Distinction between “deep” and “shallow” ecology by Arne Naess
1974.....	Publication of <i>Anarchy, the State and Utopia</i> by Robert Nozick
1976.....	Publication of <i>Animal Liberation</i> by Peter Singer
1979.....	Introduction of the Gaia theory by James Lovelock
1979.....	Margaret Thatcher appointed Prime Minister of the United Kingdom
1979.....	The Ayatollah Khomeini overthrows the Shah of Iran
1980.....	Death of Jean-Paul Sartre
1981.....	Ronald Reagan elected President of the United States
1982.....	Publication of <i>In a Different Voice</i> by Carol Gilligan
1988.....	Publication of <i>The Satanic Verses</i> by Salman Rushdie
1989.....	The Ayatollah Khomeini announces a <i>fatwah</i> on Salman Rushdie
1990.....	Death of Michael Oakeshott
1993.....	Publication of <i>Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy</i> by Robert Putnam
1998.....	Publication of <i>Libertarianism</i> by David Boaz
2000.....	Publication of <i>Bowling Alone</i> by Robert Putnam

Glossary

Remember, the meaning and content of political terms is itself part of what is contested in politics. Both those who advocate ideas in politics and those who criticize them often seek to define them in ways that reflect their ideals and interests. One important goal of this lecture series is to allow you to understand the different ways in which these terms are used and why. The following glossary is offered, therefore, as a very rough guide only to terms that you will come across in the course of these lectures; the definitions should provide enough of a context for you to be able to read around them.

Affirmative action: deliberate policies designed to overcome a history of past injustices toward members of some group by promoting their access to positions of social, political, or economic power.

Capitalism: an economic arrangement in which decisions concerning the production and distribution of goods are primarily left up to the operations of the **free market**. Capitalism is often associated today with the existence of the **liberal democracy**, but these ideas are, in fact, conceptually distinct.

Communitarianism: a school of political thought that emphasizes the importance of strong communities to human flourishing. Communitarians advocate institutions and policies intended to protect, foster, and maintain “community.” They are sometimes prepared to accept restrictions of individual liberty toward this goal.

Conservatism: an approach to politics that emphasizes the dangers involved in rapid change and seeks to preserve and extend the wisdom inherent in existing customs and institutions.

Deep ecology: the belief that we should be concerned for the integrity of ecosystems and the flourishing of nonhuman species for their own sake. Some deep ecologists have argued that nonhuman animals (and, perhaps, plants or even ecosystems themselves) should be understood to possess fundamental rights. Others have claimed that the natural world has “intrinsic value” and should be interfered with as little as possible. See also (in contrast): **shallow ecology**.

Ecology: the study of the relations of living organisms to their environment. Alternatively: those networks of relations themselves.

Existentialism: a philosophy concerned with the fundamental question of the meaning of human existence that emphasizes the role of individuals in creating meaning in the world. The major thinkers of existentialism are the Danish philosopher Soren Kierkegaard, the German philosopher Martin Heidegger, and the French writers Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir. The work of the novelists Albert Camus and Franz Kafka is also strongly associated with this tradition.

Externalities (in economics): negative consequences or costs flowing from the production process that do not accrue solely to the producer.

Fascism: an ideology defined primarily by reference to the politics of the Italian Fascist Party of Mussolini and the National Socialist German Workers Party of Adolph Hitler. It combines elements of **socialist** thought with a strong **nationalism** and a pragmatic acceptance of **capitalist** economic relations.

Feminism: an ideology premised on an analysis of the subordinate position of women in society and the need for political struggle against it. Feminism is often divided into:

Liberal feminism: which holds that overcoming the oppression of, and discrimination against, women is the conclusion (or, perhaps, a natural extension) of the liberal project.

Socialist feminism: which seeks to use socialist ideas to analyze the oppression of women and holds that this oppression can be overcome only through the establishment of socialism. Socialist feminists typically trace the origins of women's oppression to the unpaid labor they perform in the family.

Radical feminism: which argues that women's oppression stems from the fact that our society is most fundamentally a **patriarchy** and that women need to organize separately from men to pursue their own interests. Radical feminists have also advocated lesbianism as a political stance in opposition to existing heterosexual relationships, which they argue serve the interests of men.

Free market: an economic arrangement under which the price of goods and services, including labor, is determined by the uncoerced interactions of multiple independent buyers and sellers.

Ideology: the broad assumptions within which people understand and interpret the world; these may or may not be ideas of which we are conscious.

Individualism: the idea that society should be analyzed in terms of the nature of, and relations between, individuals. Also, the belief that only the interests and well being of individuals matter when evaluating the organization of society. Individualism has a strong historical association with **liberalism** and is often contrasted with **communitarianism**, **socialism**, **fascism**, **totalitarianism**, and **nationalism**.

Laissez (or laissez) faire: the doctrine that the state should not intervene in economic affairs, which should as much as possible be left to the domain of the **free market**.

Liberal democracy: a society in which individual rights are respected and political power is exercised by parties chosen in regular, free, and open elections and within limits set by constitutionalism and respect for the rule of law.

Liberalism: the belief that society should be organized to promote the freedom and flourishing of individuals. Liberalism is often divided into:

Classical liberalism: which emphasizes the importance of individual rights that may be threatened by the power of government. Classical liberals typically argue that the role of government should be limited to the protection of the rights of individuals and that economic affairs should be left to the operations of the **free market**.

Welfare liberalism: which holds that the freedom and flourishing of individuals can be attained only if they have access to certain basic resources, such as health care, education, and housing, and that the state, therefore, has an obligation to provide these resources. Doing so will necessarily involve some interference in the operations of the **free market**, at the very least because the taxation required to provide such goods involves an interference in the distribution of rewards determined by the market.

Libertarianism: an ideology that emphasizes the supremacy of the rights of individuals, especially their right to property. Libertarians typically hold that we should have the absolute minimum of government necessary and leave all other matters to the free contract of individuals.

Libertarian Socialism: a variety of non-Marxist socialism that emphasizes the freedom of the individual in a socialist society or organization.

Linguistics: the study of languages.

Means of production (in Marxist philosophy and economics): the tools and raw materials required to produce goods.

Multiculturalism: a policy of recognizing and according (limited) assistance to different cultural identities in the wider scope of Western-style liberal democracies.

Nationalism: the belief that every nation or "people" should possess its own state and that political affairs should be organized around the interests of the nation. Nationalists typically argue that citizens should take pride in their nation and have duties toward it.

Nationalization: the process of the state taking on ownership or control of an industry or resource.

Natural Law Tradition: a philosophical tradition that holds that certain "Natural Laws" exist that should govern human behavior and social organization, that these laws are given by God or are inherent in the structure of the universe, and that they are discoverable through the power of reason.

Paternalism: acting to restrict the freedom of individuals to further their interests or well being; acting on behalf of another person's "best interests."

Patriarchy (in Feminist political theory): a set of institutions in which power is overwhelmingly held and exercised by men in the interests of men.

Pluralism: the belief that many different and perhaps incomparable values exist in this world. Also, a form of society in which many different social groups coexist and share in political power.

Politics: the study of the distribution of power; who gets what, when, and how?

Queer Theory: a body of writing in political theory and cultural studies that exposes the social and historical construction of sexuality and of sexed (and gendered) bodies and identities.

Relations of production (in Marxist philosophy and economics): the social relations that govern the organization of production; the system of ownership of the **means of production**. Marx held that the relations of production determine the fundamental nature of a society. In a capitalist society, the means of production are privately owned. According to socialists, under **socialism**, they will be owned collectively by the whole society.

Secular: nonreligious. **Secularism** is the belief that religious ideas and influence should be excluded from the operation of the state. The state should not seek to promote religious ideas, nor should it justify its policies with regard to them.

Shallow ecology: the belief that we should be concerned for the flourishing of nonhuman animals and of ecosystems insofar as these relate to human interests. Such issues as global warming, the depletion of the ozone layer, pollution, and species loss are important because they threaten the welfare of human beings. Natural systems are of value insofar as they bring benefits or happiness to people rather than for their own sake. Typically a pejorative term used by those who advocate **deep ecology**.

Socialism: the belief that productive resources should be socially owned and controlled. Historically, this has usually meant state control of the economy, although alternative visions of local and democratic control do exist in the socialist tradition. Socialism is often associated with an emphasis on human *equality*, in contrast to **liberalism's** emphasis on the importance of individual freedom.

Speciesism: a term made popular by the Australian philosopher Peter Singer that is intended to convey the idea that our failure to have moral concern for the suffering of nonhuman animals is analogous to racism.

Tacit knowledge: knowledge that is not explicitly expressed or represented; knowledge of "how" to do things.

Totalitarianism: the exercise of unconstrained political power so as to order all aspects of life in a society. In totalitarian societies, such power is typically concentrated in the hands of one person or organization.

Universalism: the idea that moral principles apply universally, without reference to the particular character (for instance, the race, sex, class, nationality, and so on) of individuals. Although a familiar idea today, universalism was originally a radical notion associated with **liberalism** and one that conflicted sharply with religious (and **nationalist**) ideas about the proper organization of society.

Utilitarianism: a philosophy that holds that we should judge actions or policies according to how much pleasure they bring about (or how much suffering they cause). Its most famous expression was formulated by Jeremy Bentham, who argued that we should assess our institutions, and our laws and constitution, on the basis of what would make for the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people.

Virtue ethics: an ethical theory with origins in the thought of Aristotle that holds that we should evaluate actions according to the character traits they demonstrate in the actor. Rather than seeking to develop a *theory* of what sorts of actions are right or wrong, we should instead seek to cultivate "the virtues"—positive character traits, such as courage, wisdom, and benevolence.

Biographical Notes

Aikenhead, Thomas: Seventeenth-century Scottish student of philosophy at Edinburgh University. Executed for blasphemy.

Bentham, Jeremy: Eighteenth/nineteenth-century English philosopher and social reformer. Heralded as the founder of Utilitarianism. He argued that the morality of an act could be ascertained by referring to the Greatest Happiness Principle; that is, by calculating its impact in terms of the greatest amount of happiness of the greatest number.

Berlin, Isaiah: Twentieth-century, Latvian-born British philosopher. One of Berlin's most significant contributions to political philosophy is the distinction between negative and positive liberty. Negative liberty refers to the absence of impediment and positive liberty refers to the power to achieve an objective.

Buchanan, James: Twentieth-century American economist. Buchanan argued for a minimal state and a free market. He contended that constitutional arrangements effect economic and social development. For example, a democratic polity is prone to sacrificing gains for the wider community to vested interests.

Burke, Edmund: Eighteenth-century, Irish-born Whig politician who denounced the French Revolution as the imposition of an abstract system on a living organic community. He predicted that the revolution would end in the Terror. Burke argued that society was an organism in which diverse groups had specific functions, each of which contributed to the life of the whole.

Charles II: Stuart monarch restored after the English Civil Wars and the reign of Oliver Cromwell as Lord Protector. Having no legitimate heirs, he sought the accession of his brother James the Duke of York to the throne. This move was resisted by Parliament because of James's suspected Catholic sympathies.

Engels, Friedrich: Nineteenth-century German socialist leader and political philosopher who lived in England from 1849. Collaborated on many of Marx's works, perhaps most notably *The Communist Manifesto*. He tended to emphasize the deterministic relation between economic class and social consciousness to a greater degree than Marx.

Fanon, Franz: Twentieth-century, Martinique-born French philosopher. Fanon emphasized the importance of violence in the struggle to liberate developing states from their colonial masters.

Foucault, Michel: Twentieth-century French philosopher who argued that social and individual identity was the product of power relations.

Fourier, Charles: Nineteenth-century French social reformer who devised a plan for the efficient management of society into cooperatives. His scheme was attacked and dismissed by Marx and Engels as Utopian Socialism.

Fukuyama, Francis: Twentieth-century American civil servant and professor. Argued that history has a single end point realized in liberal democracy, which is the highest form of social and political arrangement. Those states that are not liberal democracies remain developing toward this end.

Gilligan, Carol: Twentieth-century American psychologist and radical feminist who argued that women often take a different—but equally valid—approach to moral issues than do men.

Green, Thomas Hill: Nineteenth-century English philosopher whose ideas about self-development played an important role in the development of welfare liberalism.

Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm: Nineteenth-century German philologists who studied folklore. Began the compilation of a German dictionary.

Hayek, Friedrich: Twentieth-century Austrian political philosopher who emigrated to Britain and subsequently taught in the United States. Hayek argued against central economic planning and was an important figure in the revival of interest in classical liberalism from the middle of the twentieth century.

James II: Last of the Stuart monarchs of Britain. Deposed by Parliament in the "Glorious Revolution."

Keynes, John Maynard: Twentieth-century English economist who advocated government intervention to adjust demand and maintain full employment without inflation. Keynes contributed to the establishment of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

Khomeini, The Ayatollah: Twentieth-century Iranian cleric who came to power with the overthrow of the Shah and established a fundamentalist Islamic state.

Kristol, Irving: Twentieth-century American social theorist who argued that social morality ought to be generated at a local level, such as in the family and neighborhood, leaving the state to deal with issues in high politics, such as foreign affairs.

Kuhn, Thomas S.: Twentieth-century American historian of science and philosopher, best known for his interpretation of the character of scientific revolutions.

Locke, John: Seventeenth-century English philosopher who began his career studying medicine at Oxford. Locke became family physician to the Earl of Shaftesbury and supported Shaftesbury's politics with the publication of the *Two Treatises of Government*, in which he argued for the primacy of the legislature (Parliament), as representing the will of the people, over the executive (Crown).

Lovelock, James: Twentieth-century Canadian chemist who developed the Gaia theory. Lovelock argued that the biosphere is a unified living being with moral value, but he is not against industrialization and development.

MacKinnon, Catherine: Twentieth-century American lawyer and academic who has argued for the censorship of pornography on radical feminist grounds. Pornography is understood as epitomizing the exclusion and subjection of women that is the hallmark of a patriarchal society.

Marx, Karl: Nineteenth-century German philosopher, journalist, and political economist.

Mill, James: Father of John Stuart Mill and friend and disciple of Jeremy Bentham. Mill argued that an economic style of reasoning could be extended to politics.

Mill, John Stuart: Nineteenth-century English philosopher and parliamentarian who modified Bentham's Utilitarianism. He defended individual self-development and was concerned about a possible tyranny of the majority, in which minority opinion would be silenced. Mill contended that open debate provided a necessary condition for the realization of truth. He was also a strong advocate for the political enfranchisement of women.

Millett, Kate: Twentieth-century American writer and sculptor. Millett clearly and systematically distinguished radical feminism from its liberal and socialist counterparts.

Nozick, Robert: Twentieth-century American philosopher who, in *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, explored libertarian approaches to society.

Oakeshott, Michael: Twentieth-century English philosopher who argued for a politics that seeks to accommodate changing social beliefs without imposing its own set of ideological abstractions and value judgments on society.

Plato: Ancient Greek philosopher who argued that if one knew "the good," one could not but do good. On this ground, he maintained that philosophers make the best rulers.

Putnam, Robert: Twentieth-century American social scientist who popularized the idea of social capital.

Rawls, John: Twentieth-century American philosopher whose *Theory of Justice* has had a significant influence on recent political philosophy.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques: Eighteenth-century French philosopher born in the Republic of Geneva. Rousseau held that humans were born innocent but subsequently corrupted by leisure and pride that came as the result of wealth. He proposed a political solution to humanity's alienated condition in the subscription of each to a collective general will.

Rushdie, Salman: Twentieth-century, Pakistan-born English writer. He had a *fatwah* pronounced on him because of the publication of *The Satanic Verses*, which was adjudged blasphemous by the Ayatollah Khomeini.

Sartre, Jean-Paul: Twentieth-century French philosopher, novelist, and dramatist. Sartre contributed to Existentialist philosophy by arguing that the self is the fount of all value.

Saussure, Ferdinand de: Nineteenth-century Swiss linguist. He argued for the separation of the historical from the scientific study of language.

Sen, Amartya: Twentieth-century economist and philosopher; Master of Trinity College, Cambridge; winner of the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1998.

Shaftesbury, The Earl of: Seventeenth-century Whig politician who supported the right of Parliament to exclude James II from ascending the throne of England, Scotland, and Ireland because of his Catholicism.

Sidney, Algernon: Seventeenth-century English Whig politician executed for involvement in the Rye House plot to assassinate Charles II.

Singer, Peter: Twentieth-century Australian philosopher. Bases arguments for animal welfare on utilitarian principles that moral rights are grounded in a creature's sentience rather than its rationality.

Smith, Adam: Eighteenth-century Scottish philosopher who, after beginning his career lecturing in rhetoric and moral philosophy, moved to political economy. He published *The Wealth of Nations*, in which he argued that a highly developed division of labor is the primary cause of wealth. Furthermore, the most effective motor for supplying demands is a largely self-regulating marketplace in which self-interest leads interdependent individuals to satisfy one another's wants.

Taylor, Harriet: Nineteenth-century English political and social activist. Married John Stuart Mill and encouraged him to pursue his writings and political program of liberal feminism.

Tocqueville, Alexis de: Nineteenth-century French aristocrat who published *Democracy in America*, which was based on the journals he wrote while traveling through the United States.

Weber, Max: Nineteenth/twentieth-century German economist and sociologist.

Bibliography

- Ackermann, Bruce, and Alstott, Ann. *The Stakeholder Society*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000. Two Yale Law School professors advocate that each U.S. citizen with a high school diploma should receive a bounty of \$80,000 on his or her twenty-first birthday (repayable, if people have the resources, at the end of their lives), as an interpretation of ideas about equality of opportunity.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London and New York: Verso, 1991. This work offers an interesting, influential, and highly sophisticated treatment of a "subjectivist" understanding of nationalism.
- Anderson, Terry, and Leal, Donald. *Free Market Environmentalism Today*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. A new book by two well-known proponents of these ideas.
- Arblaster, Anthony. *The Rise and Decline of Western Liberalism*. London and New York: Blackwell, 1984. Now out of print, this book can be easily found in college libraries. It offers a challenging, radical account of the history of liberalism.
- Ashcraft, Richard. *Locke's Two Treatises of Government*. London and Boston: Unwin, 1987. A readable and interesting study of Locke's thought by a leading specialist in his work.
- Baird, Robert M., and Rosenbaum Stuart E., eds. *Same Sex Marriage: The Moral and Legal Debate*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1997. An anthology, with articles for and against same-sex marriage.
- Ball, Terence, and Dagger, Richard. *Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal*, second edition. New York: HarperCollins, 1995. This U.S. college text is written by two knowledgeable and interesting political theorists. It is lively and readable and has pictures of some of the people discussed in this course.
- . *Ideals and Ideologies: A Reader*. New York: HarperCollins, 1991. A useful companion volume to *Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal*.
- Bell, Daniel P. *The End of Ideology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000. First published in 1960, this book forecast the end of ideology—only to be surprised by the revival of Marxism by the New Left at the end of the decade.
- Berki, R. N. *Socialism*. London: Dent, 1975. A useful introduction to socialist ideas. It is currently out of print but should be easily available in college libraries.
- Berlin, Isaiah. *Karl Marx: His Life and Environment*, fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. The latest edition of a "classic" biography of Marx by a writer who is critical of Marxism.
- . *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. This book contains Berlin's "Two Concepts of Liberty," which is often referred to as a classic, and introduces the much-referred-to distinction between positive and negative liberty.

- Bernstein, Richard. *Dictatorship of Virtue*. New York: Vintage, 1995. An alarmed critique of multiculturalism by a journalist who is worried by what it has meant in practical terms, for example, "political correctness."
- Boaz, David, ed. *The Libertarian Reader*. New York: Free Press, 1998. A first-rate and wide-ranging companion volume to Boaz's *Primer*.
- . *Libertarianism: A Primer*. New York: Free Press, 1997. This is an excellent and readable introduction, written by the vice president of the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C.
- Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974. Provocative study of rape as an exercise of male power over women.
- Bryson, Valerie. *Feminist Political Theory: An Introduction*. New York: Paragon House, 1992. A readable and wide-ranging guide to feminist political thought.
- Buchanan, James, et al. *The Economics of Politics*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1978. This collection contains an introduction to "public choice" theory and to the idea that institutions should be designed on the basis of incentives.
- Callinicos, Alex. *The Revenge of History*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991. This work shows how a Marxist can take a positive view of the collapse of the Soviet Union and of Soviet-dominated regimes in Eastern Europe.
- . *The Revolutionary Ideas of Karl Marx*. London: Bookmarks, 1983. This book is out of print, but it offers a lively introduction to Marx from the perspective of a Marxist activist, who is also a professor of political thought.
- Coleman, James. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1994. A heavy book—in more ways than one—on social theory, including Coleman's early work on the idea of social capital.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex* [1949]. New York: Vintage, 1989. This was a path-breaking work, which combined feminist analysis and philosophical reflection, by a distinguished French philosopher.
- de Jasay, Anthony. *Market Socialism: A Scrutiny, "This Square Circle,"* London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1990. A brief but hard-hitting critical engagement with ideas about the feasibility of market socialism.
- Devall, Bill, and Sessions, George. *Deep Ecology*. Salt Lake City, UT: G.M. Smith, 1985. An influential "classic" on deep ecology.
- Dionne, E. J., Jr. *Why Americans Hate Politics*. New York: Touchstone, 1992. This selection offers an interesting introduction to how some ideas work—the author believes, destructively—in mainstream American politics today.

Dobson, Andrew. *Green Political Thought*, third edition. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. The latest edition of a guide to political environmentalism by a widely published author on these issues.

Dworkin, Andrea. *Pornography: Men Possessing Women*. New York: Dutton, 1989. A scathing criticism of pornography as depicting the abuse of women. Because Dworkin quotes and describes some gruesome material in graphic terms, this selection will not be for every reader.

Eckersley, Robyn, ed. *Markets, the State and the Environment: Towards Integration*. South Melbourne: Macmillan Education Australia, 1995. This collection include a group of writers with environmental concerns who are not familiar with, and are, for the most part, critical of, free market environmentalist perspectives.

———. *Environmentalism and Political Theory*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992. An interesting—but not an easy—work on environmental political theory, written from the left of the political spectrum.

Elster, Jon. *An Introduction to Karl Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. An introduction to Marx's work by a writer who combines criticism with a measure of sympathy for Marx's socialism.

Foldvary, Fred E. *Public Goods and Private Communities: The Market Provision of Social Services*. Aldershot, England, and Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar, 1994. Contains fascinating information about the operation of private communities.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. "Feminism Is Not the Story of My Life." New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1996. An interesting example of a more conservative perspective *within* feminism.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Dell, 1984. Betty Friedan's work is still provocative and interesting and continues to sell very well.

Friedman, David D. *The Machinery of Freedom*, second edition. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1989. This work presents a radical, utilitarian-based approach to libertarian ideas.

Fukuyama, Frances. *Trust*. New York: Free Press, 1996. An interesting study of issues related to trust and social capital by a conservative.

———. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press, 1992. In this book, Fukuyama argues that liberal democracy represents the final stage in human political development.

Fussell, Paul. *Wartime: Understanding and Behavior in the Second World War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989. A fascinating and somewhat alarming study of the way in which people's ideas and behavior were shaped by government during the Second World War.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983. A useful source for Gellner's sociological approach to the understanding and appreciation of nationalism.

Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982. Presents Gilligan's work, which made a major impact on "difference feminism."

Goodin, Robert E., ed. *Theories of Institutional Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. This collection contains contributions (some rather difficult) by a range of scholars grappling with the problem of how best to design institutions and motivate people to work in the public interest.

Gottfried, Paul, and Fleming, Thomas. *The Conservative Movement*. Boston: Twayne, 1988. This lively account of the American conservative "movement" is written by two "insiders."

Graglia, F. Carolyn. *Domestic Tranquility: A Brief against Feminism*. Dallas: Spence, 1998. A hard-hitting critique of feminism by a conservative lawyer.

Grant, Robert. *The Politics of Sex and Other Essays: On Conservatism, Culture and Imagination*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. Essays by a contemporary writer influenced by Oakeshott.

Gray, John. *Two Faces of Liberalism*. Oxford: Polity Press, 2000. John Gray was well known as an advocate of liberalism but has become increasingly critical of liberal orthodoxies. In this, his more recent book, he offers a reinterpretation of liberalism to address the contemporary political situation.

———. *Liberalism*, second edition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.

Green, Donald P., and Shapiro, Ian. *The Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996. A hard-hitting critique, by two leading political scientists, of incentives-based approaches to the understanding and design of institutions.

Halperin, David. *Saint Foucault*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. A controversial but impassioned study of what Halperin takes to be the significance of Michel Foucault for the situation of gays and lesbians. The material is difficult, but it makes for a striking contrast with Sullivan.

Hampsher-Monk, Iain. *A History of Modern Political Thought*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992. A first-rate history of modern political thought, from which can be extracted ideas about the interplay between religious ideas and politics in a number of key thinkers.

Harrington, Michael. *The Other America*. New York: Collier, 1997. This reprint of a book first published in 1962 offers a hard-hitting look at the United States from a socialist perspective.

Haworth, Alan. *Anti-Libertarianism: Markets, Philosophy and Myth*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994. A wide-ranging critique of libertarian ideas by a British philosopher.

Hayek, Friedrich A. *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944. A "classic" exposition of the case against central economic planning.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism since 1790*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. This highly critical treatment is written from a Marxist perspective.

Holmes, Stephen. *Passions and Constraint*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995. A collection of essays dealing with a wide range of academic themes, through which Holmes also seeks to redefine liberalism.

Hunter, Michael, and Wootton, David, eds. *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. Includes a discussion of the execution of Aikenhead for blasphemy.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Touchstone, 1998. Another "big picture" view of the situation after the collapse of the Soviet Union, if you have a taste for such things, by a veteran writer on international relations.

Jagose, Annamarie. *Queer Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press, 1997. This selection offers a full but accessible guide to ideas about same-sex relationships, including some of the more turgid, but nonetheless challenging, recent theoretical ideas in this field.

Kedourie, Elie. *Nationalism*, third edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993. The most recent edition of an older and critical work written from a somewhat conservative perspective.

Kirk, Russell, ed. *The Portable Conservative Reader*. New York: Viking Penguin, 1982. This collection, edited by an influential American conservative, offers an anthology of conservative ideas. Kirk relates conservatism more closely to a religious perspective than does Muller.

Klein, Daniel, ed. *Reputation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997. A fascinating mixture of history and economic theory, dealing with how problems of trust have been overcome, informally, by commercial and noncommercial means.

Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. A welfare liberal approach to issues of multiculturalism by a distinguished Canadian philosopher.

———, ed. *The Rights of Minority Cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. Anthology offering a range of academic perspectives on issues relating to multiculturalism.

Larrabee M. J., ed. *An Ethic of Care*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993. Useful collection on issues raised by the work of Carol Gilligan.

Le Grand, Julian, and Estrin, Paul, eds. *Market Socialism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. An interesting collection by writers who argue for the possibility of combining socialist ideals and the price system.

Leibowitz, Stan J., and Margolis, Stephen E. *Winners, Losers and Microsoft*. Oakland: The Independent Institute, 1999. This book contains some interesting and provocative ideas about conventions and skeptical analysis of claims that we

face insuperable problems in changing them. (Compare their discussion of the QWERTY keyboard.)

Locke, John. *On Toleration*. See, for example, Locke, John, Horton, John, and Mendus, Susan. *John Locke: A Letter Concerning Toleration in Focus*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

Lopez, Mark. *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics 1945–1975*. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 2000. Detailed study of the emergence of multicultural ideas and their impact on Australian politics.

Lovelace, Linda. *Ordeal: An Autobiography*. New York: Bell, 1980. Linda Lovelace's autobiography is currently out of print but so many were sold that it is likely to be readily available. It is interesting, because it has become the object of argument between the critics and defenders of pornography.

MacKinnon, Catharine. *Only Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996. A brief, hard-hitting critique of pornography by a leading academic feminist, combining analysis and emotion.

Marquand, David, and Nettler, Ronald L., eds. *Religion and Democracy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000. A recent collection of essays dealing with many aspects of the interrelationship between politics and religion in a range of different cultures.

Marx, Karl. *Selected Writings*, second edition, ed. David McLellan. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. A useful selection of Marx's writings by an academic specialist on his work.

Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich. *The Communist Manifesto*. This work is available in many editions. It is an interesting and readable historical document and offers a striking introduction to Marx's ideas.

McElroy, Wendy. *A Woman's Right to Pornography*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997. An interesting defense of pornography by a libertarian feminist.

McLellan, David. *The Thought of Karl Marx: An Introduction*. London: Macmillan, 1980. Currently out of print but easily obtainable in any college library, this book provides a first-rate guide through Marx's works by period and theme, from which one can get a real feel for some of his concerns.

Mead, Lawrence, M. *The New Politics of Poverty*. New York: Basic Books, 1992. This is an interesting study in itself, written from a conservative perspective. What is significant, in the context of this course, are the assumptions that the author makes about how to motivate people.

Merquior, J. G. *Liberalism Old and New*. Boston: Twayne, 1991. A historical introduction to liberalism that surveys a broad range of material and offers interesting, sometimes opinionated, comments on it.

Mill, John Stuart. "On Liberty." In his *On Liberty and Other Essays*, ed. John Gray. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Mill's *On Liberty* is really worth reading; not only is it an important and influential work in itself, but its arguments are still widely cited today.

———. *On the Subjection of Women*. Mill's essay is readable and available in many editions; for example, it is included in the preceding selection.

Miller, David. *On Nationality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. A powerful defense of a moderate nationalism written from a democratic socialist perspective.

———, ed. *Liberty* (Oxford Readings in Politics and Government). London: Oxford University Press, 1991. Now, alas, out of print, but readily available in college libraries, this excellent anthology contains material that explores different approaches to the understanding of liberty.

Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000. Millett's book, a key text in early 1970s radical feminism, is still an interesting read; it contains much more, including literature-based discussion, than the brief presentation in this course could highlight.

Mitchell, Juliet. *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*. New York: Pantheon, 1974. An interesting exploration of whether Freudian ideas can be used in tandem with Marxism to address feminist concerns.

Muller, Jerry Z., ed. *Conservatism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997. A recent, first-rate anthology of conservative political thought, with a useful introduction.

———. *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993. An interesting study of Smith's thought by a U.S. historian, which, drawing on recent scholarship, stresses some of the less-appreciated features of his work.

Naess, Arne. *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Statement of Naess's approach to ecological issues by the originator of the term "deep ecology."

Nash, George H. *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America since 1945*. Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 1996. This work surveys a wide range of conservative and classical liberal thinkers who have been important influences on modern conservative thought in the United States.

Nisbet, Robert. *Conservatism—Dream and Reality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986. An interesting introduction to conservative ideas by a distinguished U.S. sociologist. It has recently gone out of print but can be readily obtained in college libraries.

Nozick, Robert. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books, 1974. This selection explores libertarian ideas from a philosophical perspective. Nozick—a Harvard philosophy professor—is extremely clever in his presentation and striking in his choice of examples.

Oakeshott, Michael. *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1991. Striking and exquisitely written essays by a leading twentieth-century conservative theorist.

Okin, Susan Moller, et al. *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999. Contains essays by distinguished writers, grappling with the problems posed by tensions between multiculturalism and liberal feminism.

Parekh, Bikhu. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000. Defense of multiculturalism by a British academic political theorist and race-relations specialist.

Pipes, Daniel. *The Rushdie Affair: The Novel, the Ayatollah, and the West*. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1990. An analysis of Rushdie's novel and the background to the Ayatollah Khomeini's judgment against it.

Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, fifth edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971. This is the latest edition of a work on political philosophy written by an Austrian-born philosopher of science and political theorist, which contains some particularly trenchant criticism of nationalism and a sympathetic yet critical treatment of Marxism.

Putnam, Robert. *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000. This book is fascinating, not only for its broad argument but also for the incredible wealth of interesting detail about social change during the twentieth century and the kind of lives that we lead now.

———. "Bowling Alone," *Journal of Democracy* 6, No. 1, January 1995, pp. 65–78. This was the journal article in which Putnam first discussed his worries about the decline of social capital in the United States. It should be readily available in college libraries and is currently offered on the Internet at the following URL: http://muse.jhu.edu/demo/journal_of_democracy/v006/putnam.html.

———. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994. Putnam's study of the introduction of a new level of Italian local government, which sparked his work on social capital.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971. Rawls is, emphatically, not a socialist, but a welfare liberal. Some of the ideas in his work, however, have also led to a reinvigoration of the territory between welfare liberalism and socialism.

Reich, Robert B. *Locked in the Cabinet*. New York: Vintage, 1998. An engaging and self-deprecating first-hand account of some of the frustrations of a man of ideas involved at the heart of recent U.S. politics.

Roemer, John E. *A Future for Socialism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994. A lively defense of socialism as feasible by a leading American socialist economist.

Rosenblum, Nancy. *Membership and Morals*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000. An interesting and wide-ranging study of a number of different kinds of associations and the roles they play in their members' lives,

including militias! The book is worth reading as a reminder of the character of some forms of associations.

Sandel, Michael. *Democracy's Discontent*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996. Sandel is not a conservative, but he is a key "communitarian" intellectual whose work illustrates, in striking ways, the manner in which certain conservative themes have recently been developed by those who would see themselves on the political left.

Schmidtz, David, and Goodin, Robert. *Social Welfare and Individual Responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. This exciting book pitches two able philosophers—a classical and a welfare liberal—against one another on the issue of responsibility for welfare.

Scruton, Roger. *The Meaning of Conservatism*. London: Macmillan, 1980. This account, by an able British philosopher, brings out some of the illiberal aspects of the conservative tradition. A second edition is about to be published.

Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books, 1999. Sen is also not a socialist, but his work on the significance of entitlements and democracy, and on the freedoms of those in both Western and developing countries, has also helped to reinvigorate the area between non-Marxist socialism and welfare liberalism as we are familiar with it in the practice of Western countries today.

Sessions, George, ed. *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, 1994. Collection of essays explaining the "deep ecology" perspective.

Shearmur, Jeremy. *Hayek and After*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Discussion of the distinctive version of classical liberalism developed by Friedrich Hayek and of what might be needed to develop these ideas further.

———. *The Political Thought of Karl Popper*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Takes further some of the ideas of the author of this course, by way of a critical discussion of the political thought of the philosopher Karl Popper.

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation*, revised edition. New York: Avon/Hearst Corporation, 1991. This work combines utilitarian philosophy and details of how animals are treated to present a case that animals should be treated very differently and to argue in favor of vegetarianism.

Smith, Anthony. *Nationalism and Modernism*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. This recent work by a specialist offers a broad account of different theories of nationalism.

Sommers, Christine. *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994. A defense of liberal feminism, in broadly the tradition of J. S. Mill against radical feminism.

Steele, David Ramsay. *From Marx to Mises*. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1992. A striking presentation of the "Austrian" critique of socialism.

Strossen, Nadine. *In Defense of Pornography*. New York: New York University Press, 2000. Defense of pornography on free-speech grounds by an academic lawyer and president of the ACLU.

Sullivan, Andrew, ed. *Same Sex Marriage: Pro and Con—A Reader*. New York: Vintage, 1997. A useful anthology, with articles for and against same-sex marriage.

———. *Virtually Normal*. New York: Vintage, 1996. A challenging book by a writer whose broad views are conservative or classical liberal, in favor of gay marriage. He engages with religious-based objections to his views.

Tamir, Yael. *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993. This is a defense of nationalism and, in particular, an argument about its compatibility with (welfare) liberalism.

Tawney, Richard Henry. *Equality*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1931. A powerful study by an influential British socialist who was inspired by Christian ideals. It went through many editions and will be available in college libraries or used bookstores.

Taylor, Charles, and Gutmann, Amy, eds. *Multiculturalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994. An interesting collection on multiculturalism, centered on an essay by the Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor. Gutmann's introduction to the volume is especially recommended.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. For example, tr. George Lawrence, ed. J. P. Mayer, London: Fontana, 1994. See, especially, Part 1, chapters 4 and 6; Part 2 chapters 1–8.

Vincent, Andrew. *Political Ideologies*, second edition. London and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1995. This study is more advanced than Ball and Dagger's; it is challenging and reflective but may take for granted ideas with which readers who are first approaching this course are not familiar.

Waldron, Jeremy. *Liberal Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. A striking collection of papers on themes relating to liberalism by that rare phenomenon, an academic who can deal with difficult and important issues yet write lucidly.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* [1792]. This powerful early feminist work is available in many editions; for example, Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, ed. Ashley Tauchert, London: Everyman Paperbacks, 1995.

Wright, Anthony. *Socialisms: Theories and Practises*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1986. A survey of various interpretations of socialism by a British writer who has considerable sympathy for socialist ideals.

Zimmerman, Michael E., ed. *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*. Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997. This useful anthology contains contributions that discuss a whole range of approaches to environmental issues.